THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY
IN THE
TEACHING OF CHARLES GORE

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of Divinity
The University of Edinburgh

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Harold Paul Nebelsick
April 1956
ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate  Harold Paul Nebelsick
Degree  Doctor of Philosophy  Date  April 14, 1956
Title of Thesis  THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY IN THE TEACHING OF CHARLES GORE

With the publication of Lux Mundi, Charles Gore, head of the Lux Mundi group and editor of the volume, was instrumental in opening a new era in Anglican theology. However, Gore is not only the harbinger of a new theological epoch, he is, in a real sense, a synthesis of the two theological movements, Tractarianism and Liberalism, that were born to English theology nearly a half century earlier; both these movements were a combination of Biblical and philosophical concepts.

Tractarianism, though it had its beginnings in Romanticism, in its attempt to give the Church substantiality, adopted both a rationalistic basis for its doctrine of the Church, i.e. the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, understood as an unbroken succession of consecrations, and a rationalistic interpretation of the Scriptures which defied Biblical criticism. Liberalism gave rise to Biblical-criticism and was, in England, integrally bound up with Idealism. This is seen especially in the persons of Coleridge and Jowett, whose philosophical concepts, along with the personal Idealism of T. H. Green, formed a definite influence on Gore. However, in the persons of Coleridge, Arnold, and especially Westcott, Biblical-critical thought was given a strong Biblical-positive attitude which endowed Gore with his great respect for the Scriptures.

Thus, from the Tractarians, Gore inherited a rationalistic doctrine of Apostolic Succession on which he based his doctrines of the Church and the Ministry, but he combined this with a critical, though respectful attitude toward the Scriptures and the then current Idealism. This combination is basic to the Liberal Catholicism which Gore was instrumental in bringing to birth. Throughout Gore's thought and especially that related to the Church and the Ministry, we see the three factors of his endowment in constant interplay.

In his apology for Biblical criticism, Gore maintains the need for criticizing the Scriptures and hence rejects the rationalistic interpretation of them as professed by the later Tractarians. However, his strong respect for the Bible leads him to hold to the historicity of the New Testament while his "high" view of the Church causes an ambivalence to prevail between the primacy of Scriptures and Church. Hence, he vacillates between asserting the supremacy of first the one and then the other as the occasion demands.

Basic to Gore's philosophical precepts is his adherence to a concept of reason as man's subjective faculty for the apprehension of truth. In spanning both the realms of the natural and the supernatural, reason demands that reality be a unity. Further, Gore accepts Green's epistemological argument for the necessity of a divine mind, along with the concepts of emergent evolution as represented by Bergson and Pringle-Pattison. These he combines with the Judaeo-Christian concept of a revealing God to produce a system wherein Christ can be interpreted either as a result of emergent evolution or direct revelation; all conflicts between faith and reason and knowledge are reconciled because faith is a function of reason; and morality, reasonableness, self-realization and salvation are equated since all are the result of becoming God-like. Hence, sin, which is disobedience to God, prevents moral achievement, and the locus for moral endeavour, i.e. self-realization, i.e. salvation, is the Church. Further, in that man possesses a subjective capacity for the apprehension of truth, Gore maintains that the individual decision is primary, and in line with his preconceiving reality as a unity, he demands a Weltanschauung which comprises all branches of knowledge.

In his doctrine of the Church, Gore is very largely Biblical when he is descriptive. The Church is designated as a single, visible society, a catholic fellowship founded by Christ. It is the New Israel re-founded from the Old, as well as to a certain extent the embodiment of the kingdom of God. The Church is also the Body of Christ, but when Gore explains this term, he introduces his doctrine of the Church as the Ex...
tension of the Incarnation which goes hand in hand with his doctrine of Kenosis. Both these doctrines receive meaning from Gore's idealistic notions and the Church is explained as the extension of the Incarnation because Christ is immanent in the members of the Church, activating them to moral achievement.

The function of the Church as Prophet is both to teach a moral standard to its membership and to uphold its creedal position. As Priest, the Church must be reconciled unto itself in unity and its membership must be morally reconciled to God. The Church acts as King in enforcing discipline first over itself, its clergy, and members, and secondly over the world in which it acts as moral leader.

For Gore, the sacraments of the Church have their roots wholly in Jewish soil. Further, they are not of the nature of flat because they demand the faith of the individual to receive them. Gore gives credence to seven sacraments: Baptism, Holy Communion, Confirmation, Penance, Matrimony, Ordination and Unction of the Sick, though he gives precedence to the two sacraments - Baptism and the Eucharist. Baptism, though defined by New Testament terminology, has its real meaning only as the rite of admittance to the Church and must be completed by Confirmation wherein the Holy Spirit is bestowed. The Eucharist is the highest act of Christian worship and is the occasion for the partaking of the actual Body and Blood of the glorified Christ. It is also described as a sacrifice, primarily because it is the occasion for the individual to offer himself.

The Ministry of the Church was instituted by Christ in the persons of the twelve apostles who were intended to perpetuate their office by ordaining followers by the laying-on of hands. Thus, there was to be a succession of those so ordained, and these are essential to the existence of the Church. Of this succession the present bishops of the Anglican Communion are a part. The ministry functions in conjunction with the Church in fulfilling the offices of Prophet, Priest and King. As Prophet, it acts in a teaching capacity; as Priest, it administers the sacraments - the bishops, on whom the rest of the ministry depend, have the exclusive function of bestowing the Spirit at Confirmation and Ordination. In its Kingly function, the ministry, with the congregation, enforces discipline. Gore admits that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, as he understands it, is not explicitly stated in the New Testament, and so he bases his argument for the doctrine on Church authority which argument can be used to destroy the doctrine itself.

In attempting to prove his doctrine of Apostolic Succession from the evidence of the development of the ministry, Gore begins with Irenaeus and Tertullian because he is certain that they propounded the doctrine as an unbroken succession of consecrations when they refer to the lineage of bishops from the apostles to their own time in order to substantiate the orthodoxy of the Church. When attempting to justify this doctrine by the New Testament, Gore finds a general apostolic group who have the power of laying-on of hands and appointing local ministers and successors. He points especially to the instances of the Apostle Paul commissioning Timothy and Titus as his successors, and maintains that the method by which monepiscopacy arose was by the localization of members of the general apostolic group who then became bishops. Though admitting that there is very fragmentary light in the subapostolic period, he puts great trust in Ignatius' testimony that monepiscopacy was universal. However, he later refutes this statement with evidence from the Didache, Clement, Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas, whose evidence, at best, can be used to indicate that the ministry remained much the same as it is described in the New Testament. Hence, Gore really fails to indicate the method by which monepiscopacy arose.

In conclusion, we find that Gore's casuistic doctrine of Apostolic Succession goes hand in hand with his definition of the Church as the locus of moral endeavour. This thinking which is the result of an inherited rationalistic doctrine of Apostolic Succession and his inherent Idealism would seem to have little except its terminology in common with Apostolic Christianity. Also, we find that though the type of thinking represented by Gore is much alive today in the Anglican Church, it is being controverted by theologians who are basing their thought on Biblical theology. However, the historical unity in the Church which Gore believes his doctrine of Apostolic Succession to provide must not be given up. Neither must the concept of Apostolic Succession disappear, but the true APOTOLIC SUCCESSION necessary for the being of the Church is an historical succession of Believers and Witnesses to Christ. Where Christ is with these, there is His CHURCH.
TO MY WIFE
PREFACE

We find ourselves in this century in the throes of the most exciting and perhaps most far reaching development in the Church since the Reformation. We see that God is leading the Church to heal its wounds, wounds of the broken Body of Christ. However, our healing is not without pain. As Churches, we are being forced to uncover our theological foundations and recognize our theological differences.

We are finding that one of the barriers to our unity is our disagreement as to what we are and how we are to be defined. Wherein we have, in the past, largely adopted the thoughts of our Fathers, we are being led to realize that our whole thought in regard to the Church has to be referred back to the mind of Christ in whom we either live and move and have our being, or we have no being. Thus, though it means breaking with much loved traditions, we are drawn into unity only as we refer ourselves for correction back to the original witness in the New Testament of Him who is yet interceding for us and praying that we may be one as He and His Father are one.

In this thesis we meet an extremely well qualified representative of one of the schools of thought represented today in the Ecumenical Movement. Bishop Charles Gore, inheriting his basic doctrine of the Church and the Ministry from the
Oxford Movement, but tempering that thought with both Biblical-criticism and Idealism gives voice to a type of theological thinking that is very much alive today. Therefore, we do well to examine the sources, the content, and something of the contemporary relevance of the theology of this great Englishman in reference to the Church and the Ministry in the hope that we will be somewhat aided in the understanding of the present day theological situation.

The present writer is Presbyterian and he does not approach this subject without bias. He desires only that he will be enabled to see the evidence fairly and draw his conclusions accordingly.

It remains for me to express my gratitude to the Rev. Professor Thomas F. Torrance, New College, Edinburgh and the Rev. Principal Charles S. Duthie, Congregational Christian College, Edinburgh, who supervised my work and who offered many valuable suggestions which I have incorporated in the following pages; to Miss E. R. Leslie and the Rev. J. A. Lamb who offered patient assistance in procuring most of the necessary literature for this thesis from the New College Library; to the staff of the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh who made my research easier by kindly furnishing needed materials; to Mr. Morris Ogg and Mr. Eric Evans, Edinburgh who read the text for errors and Americanisms; to Mrs.
T. H. Young and Mr. and Mrs. Eric Evans, Edinburgh, who graciously shared their home with my wife and me during the writing of this thesis; to the parents of my wife, Mr. and Mrs. Harold W. Koehler, Clarkston, Washington, and my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis D. Nebelsick, Alexandria, South Dakota, for the sacrifices they have made to make my study in Europe possible; and to my wife, Melissa, who is not only responsible for reading and typing of the manuscript, but whose companionship and encouragement have aided me greatly in the preparation of this work. The dedication of this thesis to her is but a small indication of my gratitude.

Harold F. Nebelsick

Edinburgh

April 14, 1956
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PART I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
INTRODUCTION

CHARLES GORE AND LUX MUNDI

While Charles Gore was a don at Trinity whence he went after a brilliant undergraduate career at Balliol, he was drawn into a circle of men including, among others, Henry Scott Holland, Edward Stuart Talbot, and J. R. Illingworth. These young theologians were urgently engaged in the task of attempting to reconcile the claims of revelation and reason. G. L. Prestige, Gore's biographer, points out: "The group consisted of college dons in holy orders, who were united in loyalty to the Catholic creeds and constitution of the Church, and all at the same time adhered to the ancient ecclesiastical conception of human reason as a valid instrument of knowledge and a direct link between mankind and the divine creative Reason."

In 1875 this group adopted what later became an annual practice, the plan of occupying a small country parish during the month of the incumbent's holiday. During this month, be-


3 Prestige, loc. cit.
sides assuming and performing the parish duties, the members of the group joined in the common recitation of daily services, observed the customary hours of prayer, read, and above all discussed theological problems. Of this circle, which was known as the "Holy Party", Gore became the recognized leader, or as Holland called him, the "Pope".

In the minds of the members of the party, the great question of the day was the deep chasm which separated the Catholic faith on one side and modern knowledge on the other. Therefore, in 1889 they attempted to reconcile the claims of reason and revelation by publishing a series of essays under the title, Lux Mundi.

Upon its appearance, Lux Mundi shook the religious world, and its publication is considered to be "a turning point in the theology of the Catholic revival". Michael Ramsey reminds us of Lux Mundi's present import by stating

2 Prestige, op. cit., p. 81.
3 Mansbridge, op. cit., p. 72.
4 Prestige, loc. cit.
that it opened an era in Anglican theology,\(^1\) and that the "conservatively critical scholarship" of the writers was the dominant force in theology in England for 40 years after its publication.\(^2\)

The intention of the writers of *Lux Mundi*, as pointed out by Gore, himself, in the Preface to the work, was "to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems".\(^3\) Further, Gore asserts that the writers of the essays included in the volume took their stand as "servants of the Catholic Creed and Church",\(^4\) and that they were attempting a reconciliation which should at once set the scientific and critical movement free from the peril of irreligion, and the religious movement free from the imputation of hostility to new knowledge.\(^5\)

Therefore, *Lux Mundi* was not only the springboard for a new era of Anglican theology, but it was in a real sense, a culmination and a summing up of the century's two theological

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 16.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. viii.
movements—Tractarianism, which gave rise to Anglo-Catholicism on the one hand, and Liberalism, which resulted in Biblical criticism on the other.\(^1\)

The fact that Gore was considered to be a loyal son of the Tractarians is hardly open to question. His status in the eyes of the later followers of the Oxford Movement is evident in his being appointed the first Principal of Pusey House, a monument to one of the greatest of the Tractarian party. In a letter written on the occasion of Pusey's death, Gore records his feeling of immense loss in no longer having "the great & consoling & reassuring voice".\(^2\) He admonishes those to whom he is writing to the effect that they should keep together, discourage vagaries, and "strengthen one another in holding fast the old Faith [Italics not in original]".\(^3\) Again, Gore's loyalty to the Tractarian cause is evidenced by his publication, *The Anglo-Catholic Movement Today* in which he reasserts his allegiance to the basic Tractarian principles.

However, Gore was well aware of the fact that he was not a disciple of the Tractarians only. Consequently upon being

---

\(^1\) Ramsey points out that *Lux Mundi* represents a synthesis of High Churchmanship and contemporary critical thought. Ramsey, *op. cit.*, p. 3.


formally appointed to the charge of Fusey House in November, 1883, he informed Liddon that he was by no means disposed to adhere to every point of doctrine as taught by Dr. Fusey.\(^1\) Gore had, in fact, drunk deeply from the liberal streams that had begun to flow noticeably through theological thought since the beginning of the century. He had accepted quite thoroughly many of the conclusions of the Biblical critics and therefore, frankly desired to be known as a "Liberal Catholic".\(^2\)

In that Gore, by his own admission, as well as by the evidence of his publications, is a disciple of both the Tractarian and Liberal movements of nineteenth century Anglicanism, it will be necessary to understand something of these schools of thought by which he was influenced before we can understand the thought of Gore himself.


CHAPTER I

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

The Romantic Mood of the Oxford Movement

In describing the temper of the times into which the Oxford Movement was born, accounting for the spirit that gave it birth, John Henry Newman, the leading light of the Movement, makes reference to an article written in April, 1839, of which he was joint author. In this article Newman considers the Movement a reaction from the "dry and superficial character of the religious teaching and literature of the last generation or century . . . a result of the need which was felt by the hearts and intellects of the nation for a deeper philosophy".


2 John Henry Newman, Apologia Pro Vita Sua (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1890), p. 94. The article was written by Newman with the help of a friend for the "British Critic" (April, 1839) and was later incorporated in Newman's Essays Critical and Historical under the title, "Prospects of the Anglican Church". It is summarized by Newman in his Apologia Pro Vita Sua. Ibid., pp. 94 ff. Newman assures us that at the writing of his Apologia, the main principle of the Oxford Movement was as dear to him as it ever was. He states: "What I held in 1816, I held in 1833, and I hold in 1864." Ibid., p. 49.

Newman maintains that the mood of the Movement was fostered by men of literature. He refers to Sir Walter Scott stating: "A great poet was raised up in the North, who . . . has contributed by his works, in prose and verse, to prepare men for some closer and more practical approximation to Catholic truth". Scott, he says, had turned men's minds to the direction of the Middle Ages and stimulated his readers' mental thirsts, "feeding their hopes, setting before them visions, when once seen, are not easily forgotten, and silently indoctrinating them with nobler ideas, which might afterwards be appealed to as first principles". Newman then commends Coleridge, designating him "a very original thinker". He maintains that though Coleridge had indulged in non-Christian speculation and often advocated heathen conclusions, he, nevertheless, "installed a higher philosophy into inquiring minds, than they had hitherto been accustomed to accept. In this way he made trial of his age, and succeeded in interesting its genius in the cause of Catholic truth". Thereafter, Newman acclaims Southey and Wordsworth as "two living poets, one of whom in the department of fan-


tastic fiction, the other in that of philosophical meditation, have addressed themselves to the same high principles and feelings, and carried forward their readers in the same direction". 1

In sum Newman maintains of the Oxford Movement:

It was not so much a movement as a "spirit afloat;" it was within us, rising up in hearts where it was least suspected, and working itself, though not in secret, yet so subtly and impalpably, as hardly to admit of precaution or encounter on any ordinary human rules of opposition. It is . . . an adversary in the air, a something one and entire, a whole wherever it is, unapproachable and incapable of being grasped, as being the result of causes far deeper than political or other visible agencies, the spiritual awakening of spiritual wants. 2

Such was the mood that held the day and the minds of the founders of the Oxford Movement. It was the Romantic mood generated by an interest in an idealized rather than an actual past. It was a temper, as Newman had said when dealing with Scott, that silently indoctrinated men with "nobler ideas, which might afterwards be appealed to as first principles". 3

1 Newman, Apologia, p. 97; Essays, p. 269.

2 Newman, Apologia, p. 98. Cf. Essays, p. 272. One can hardly expect to read a better or more forceful account of the temper of the times expressed in so short a space.

Six years before the opening of the Oxford Movement, Keble had caught the tone of the prevalent Romanticism in the verses of his *Christian Year*. Throughout the poems of the work the line between the disagreeable facts of the actual world and idealized state of things is distinctly drawn. Keble speaks of the service on earth as being sad and hard, a room of sickness where each heart knows its own anguish and unrest, but he assures his readers that the angels make the martyr's fire like "summer breeze by woodland stream". The faithful are pictured as yielding sweetly to the rod, and the Christian pastor "bow'd to earth with thankless toil, and vile esteem'd" is preserved from living death because the Saviour walks with him. Indeed, in the presence of God


3 Ibid., "St. Barnabas", p. 236.


5 Ibid., p. 237.
all shadows fall, earth's weariness is transformed, the cutting edge of life disappears.\footnote{Ibid., "Evening", p. 4.} Noble pictures the Church as God's New Israel, "sunk as low, yet flourishing to sight as fair, as Sion".\footnote{Ibid., "Thursday before Easter", p. 116.} It is the "apostate Church"\footnote{Ibid., "Fifth Sunday in Lent", p. 100.} and a wandering Church.\footnote{Ibid., "Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity", p. 231.} She is the spouse who low at the feet of Christ renews her vows. "She pleads by all Thy mercies, told Thy chosen witnesses of old".\footnote{Ibid., "Holy Communion", p. 324.} The Church is the meeting place for souls who "by nature are pitch'd too high, by sufferings plung'd too low".\footnote{Ibid., "St. Philip and St. James", p. 285. Liddon records that Pusey held that the real source of the Oxford Movement was to be found in the \\textit{Christian Year}. Liddon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 270.}

The romantic temper of the Oxford Movement can be again seen in Richard Hurrell Froude, whom Newman declares is as much an author of the Oxford Movement as anyone else.\footnote{John Henry Newman, \textit{Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching} (London: Burns, Oates, & Company, \textit{[n.d.]}, p. 32.} Also, Froude is acclaimed by Newman as the one who taught him to "look with admiration toward the Church of Rome".\footnote{Newman, \textit{Apologia}, p. 25.}

Though expressing appreciation of many of the practices

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ibid., "Evening", p. 4.}
\item \textit{Ibid., "Thursday before Easter", p. 116.}
\item \textit{Ibid., "Fifth Sunday in Lent", p. 100.}
\item \textit{Ibid., "Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity", p. 231.}
\item \textit{Ibid., "Holy Communion", p. 324.}
\item \textit{Ibid., "St. Philip and St. James", p. 285. Liddon records that Pusey held that the real source of the Oxford Movement was to be found in the \textit{Christian Year}. Liddon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 270.}
\item \textit{Newman, \textit{Apologia}, p. 25.}
\end{itemize}
of the Roman Communion such as the daily service and the priest kneeling with his back to the people,\(^1\) Proude was, nevertheless, indignant with the Roman Catholic Church as such and the actual system of Rome. He found, to his horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever.\(^2\) He thinks Roman communicants idolatrous\(^3\) and feels that the power of the priesthood of the Roman Church rests on a hollow basis.\(^4\) He is repelled by the low estate of priests whom he has seen in Naples laughing when at confessional and of the gross immorality of the people.\(^5\) Comparing his observations of Roman practices to those of the Church of England, Froude states:

The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall.\(^6\)

Further, he calls the Roman Catholics "wretched Tridentines",\(^7\) and maintains that he never could be Romanist.\(^8\) Moreover, he

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 307.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. xiii.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 293.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 294.
\(^6\) Loc. cit.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 434.
\(^8\) Loc. cit.
hopes for a total overthrow of the Roman Catholic system. 1

Nevertheless, Froude's deepest sympathies are with the Roman Catholic Church rather than with his own. He is vehement in his hatred for the Reformers, 2 and he has no sympathy whatsoever for Protestants. 3 He maintains that the present system of the Church of England is "an incubus upon the country". 4 He states: "We have blasphemed Tradition and the Sacraments". 5 He avows: "The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted." 6

It is because of Froude's deep-set Romanticism that he is able to wish for the complete overthrow of the Roman Church and still advocate Roman Catholic practices. His mind, in fact, was not on the Roman Church which his eyes saw, the actual procedures of which repelled him. He was thinking of a Church which incorporated that which he advocated while being free from the iniquity which he saw, i.e. the Medieval Church or, more correctly, an idealized Medieval Church. 7 Re-

1 Ibid., p. 308.
3 Cf. Ibid., pp. 365, 366, 391, 421, 425.
4 Ibid., p. 405.
5 Ibid., p. 438.
6 Ibid., p. 433.
placing in his mind the actual Roman Catholic Church with an idealized concept of the Medieval Church, Froude was quite capable of possessing Roman Catholic sympathies.\(^1\) Thus he proposed that he should never call the Holy Eucharist "'the Lord's Supper'\(^3\), God's priests "'ministers of the word'\(^4\), or the altar "'the Lord's Table'\(^2\).

Froude's Romantic temperament is most apparent in his judgment that the Church of England's saints were with rare exceptions deficient in "the austere beauty of the Catholic \(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\)\(^3\). He felt that the Roman Catholic saints were superior to those of the Church of England because they were of a "more sentimental imaginative cast".\(^4\)

The early years of the nineteenth century were an era in which Liberalism was making itself felt in the practical world. The Revolution had been accomplished in France, an event which so antagonized Newman that he records that he could not bring himself to gaze upon the tricolour flying from the mast of a French vessel in a Mediterranean port.\(^5\)

Also, Coleridge's philosophy propagated by his works, then

\(^1\) Cf. Froude, \(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\), I, 399.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 394 f.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 395.
\(^4\) Loc. cit.
\(^5\) Newman, \(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)\(^3\), p. 33.
known at Oxford,\textsuperscript{1} followed by the influence of Arnold\textsuperscript{2} culminating in his pamphlet, "The Principles of Church Reform",\textsuperscript{3} were causing men to question the traditional grounds of theology. In British politics the Liberals had come to power and threatened to unseat established institutions.\textsuperscript{4} The Whigs were in the majority, and with the passage of the Reform Bill, Parliament threatened the Church with disruption.\textsuperscript{5} As Newman indicates:

No time was to be lost, for the Whigs had come to do their worst, and the rescue might come too late. Bishopricks were already in course of suppression; Church property was in course of confiscation; Sees would soon be receiving unsuitable occupants.\textsuperscript{6}

The Beginning of the Oxford Movement

On July 14, 1833, Mr. Keble preached his Assize Sermon

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ward, op. cit., p. 430. Cf. Liddon, op. cit., I, 292 f.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Arnold's proposal was to identify Church and State by including all denominations in one Established Church. Liddon, op. cit., I, 265. For a similar opinion cf. S. T. Coleridge, Aids to Reflection (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., [n.d.]), p. 239.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Liddon, op. cit., p. 265 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Newman, Apologia, pp. 43 f.
\end{itemize}
in the University pulpit, a sermon which was published under the title, *National Apostacy*. This marked the beginning of the Oxford Movement. The leaders of the Oxford Movement saw that, if it pursued its protracted policies, the State might well be the death of the Church. Erastianism was believed to be the heresy which practically cut the root from all revealed truth. Therefore, it became necessary, in the eyes of the Tractarians, to set the Church on a firm basis.

In reference to the beginning of the Oxford Movement, Newman states:

I wanted to bring out in a substantive form a living Church of England, in a position proper to herself, and founded on distinct principles; so far as paper could do it, as far as earnestly preaching it and influencing others towards it, could tend to make it a fact;—a living Church, made of flesh and blood, with voice, complexion, and motion and action, and a will of its own.

Hence it was in direct opposition to the State that the Oxford Movement was born. The Romantic mood had taught the men who formed the movement to look into the past, a past which was idealized, for foundations on which they could build. There they saw the Church as an institution which

---

1 Liddon, *op. cit.*, pp. 267 ff. Newman states: "I have ever considered and kept the day, as the start of the religious movement of 1833." Newman, *Apologia*, p. 35.


3 Liddon, *op. cit.*, I, 277.

had substantiality, which was independent, and being so was able to ward off the world. The Tractarians saw that the basis for this institution was its episcopal ministry perpetuated according to a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Therefore, without first investigating history and the Scriptures in order to authenticate their move, they adopted the doctrine of Apostolic Succession along with the orthodoxy of the Prayer Book as the ground on which they were to build the movement.

Referring to the origins of the movement, Newman declares: "The whole system of revealed truth was . . . to be carried out upon the anti-Erastian or Apostolical basis". It was for the independence of the Church that the Oxford Movement was striving. According to Newman:

---


2 Understood as a succession of consecrations. Cf. post Chaps. VIII, IX, X.


4 Newman, Difficulties Felt by Anglicans, p. 90 f.

5 In his critique of the Oxford Movement, Gore states: "It was to re-establish in the minds of churchmen the idea of the Catholic Church, of which the Church of England claimed to be a living part." Charles Gore, The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1923), p. 4.
It was for this that the writers of whom I speak had recourse to Antiquity, insisted upon the Apostolic Succession, exalted the Episcopate, and appealed to the people, not only because these things were true and right, but in order to shake off the State; they introduced them in the first instance [Italics not in original] as a means toward the insculption of the idea of the Church, as constituent portions of that great idea which, when it once should be received, was a match for the world.¹

There is no doubt, however, that the Tractarians felt they were building upon the foundations of Apostolic doctrine and usage.² Further, in returning to what he considered to be "Apostolic doctrine", Newman, for one, was certain that he was not betraying the Church of which he was a member. He states that the doctrine for which the Tractarians stood were to be found in the writings of Andrews, Laud, Bramhall, Stillingfleet, Butler and others of its divines but that it had never received concrete expression.³ The leaders of the Oxford Movement felt that they were simply being instrumental

ⁱ Newman, Difficulties Felt by Anglicans, p. 91. Here we see the two-fold nature of the Oxford Movement. It was Romantic in origin in its view of the past from where it chose its principles, but Scholastic in method in that it finally adopted principles then apologized for them rather than first carrying out extensive investigations either to discover valid fundamentals or to prove those adopted before disseminating them, hence Fairbairn's judgment that Pusey used his scholarship to stabilize the position of the movement rather than discover truth. Fairbairn, op. cit., pp. 305 ff.


³ Newman, Difficulties Felt by Anglicans, p. 34.
in the restoration of primitive Christianity.\(^1\)

Newman records that he felt certain that the one way to meet liberal principles whether in the Church or in the University\(^2\) was to give to the world the teaching and writings of the Fathers in their fullest measure. To him the Apostolic form of doctrine "was essential and imperative, and its grounds of evidence impregnable".\(^3\) He writes:

I had a supreme confidence in our cause; we were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican divines. That ancient religion had well nigh faded away out of the land, through the political changes of the last 150 years, and it must be restored. It would be in fact a second Reformation:—a better reformation, for it would be a return not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth.\(^4\)

Again he asserts that to him "Via Media"\(^5\) implied dogma, the sacramental system, and anti-Romanism.\(^6\) He rested its doctrine on Scripture, the Anglican Prayer Book and St. Ignatius's Epistles,\(^7\) the Episcopal system being founded on St.

\(1\) Newman, \textit{Apologia}, p. 43.

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 56 f.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 44.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 43.

\(^5\) Newman's name for the Anglican Church as he conceived it.

\(^6\) Newman, \textit{Apologia}, p. 69.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 50.
Apostolic Succession as the Basis of the Oxford Movement

Though Newman states he was rather impatient with the doctrine of Apostolic Succession the first time he heard it from a Fellow of Oriel about the year 1823, this doctrine which, according to Newman, was built upon the teachings of Ignatius, was from the first the chief cornerstone in the Tractarian doctrinal development. The doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which gave the Church an independence of its own, was apropos in the situation since besides being integral to the idealized Medieval Church, it gave it organizational stability, it provided visible contact with the primitive Church, and it was tenable since the actual successive line had never

---

1 Loc. cit. Pusey who joined the movement somewhat after its birth was the scholar of the group. Liddon, op. cit., I, 272 f. His entrance into the fold of the Tractarians gave the movement, according to Newman, "a position and a name". Newman, Apologia, p. 61. Cf. Liddon, op. cit., I, 343 ff. Pusey's interest in the Apostolic Church, exemplified by his beginning his publications of studies of the Fathers, gave the Tractarian interest in the primitive Church a surer foundation. Speaking of Keble, Newman and Pusey, Fairbairn points out that they were "in a rare degree complementary of each other; they were respectively poet, thinker, and scholar, and each contributed to the movement according to his kind". Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 297.

2 Newman, Apologia, p. 10.

3 Ibid., p. 50.
been broken in the Church of England. Though Newman admits in the last of the Tracts that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is nowhere mentioned in the Thirty-Nine Articles, it is, nevertheless, the note on which the movement opened and the refrain which carried all the way through. This is evident in the Tracts.

In the Tracts the bishops of the Church of England are spoken of as "SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES" to be obeyed as Luke and Timothy obeyed St. Paul. The "APOSTOLIC DESCENT" is called "the real ground" of the clergy's authority, and the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is explained as the handing down of the Spirit of Christ which Jesus gave to His apostles who in turn laid their hands on those succeeding them until "the sacred gift has been handed down to our present

1 Though Newman complained that the Bishop of London had said that the doctrine went out with the Non-jurors. Newman, Apologia, pp. 30 ff.


4 From which the members of the movement received the name, "Tractarians".

5 Newman, Tract 1, I, op. cit., 1.

6 Ibid., p. 2.
Bishops". The Holy Ghost is said to be committed at ordination on the priest by the imposition of hands; it is given for the priestly function of forgiving and retaining of sins, the dispensing of the word of God and the sacraments.

Further, it is argued that those who are not ordained by the imposition of hands of a legitimate bishop are not really ordained. Again, Apostolic Succession is spoken of as being the "safest course" for the Church. It is the warrant which insures that the clergy are exclusively God's ambassadors.

Again it is explained that without Apostolic Succession, "the Great Seal", which was the claim to canonical obedience in the primitive Church, the clergy cannot be sure that they convey the sacrifice of the Holy Feast, for "Jesus Christ's own commission is the best external security I can have, that in receiving this bread and wine, I verily receive His Body and Blood". Hence the doctrine alone validates the sacraments.

---

1 Loc. cit.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., p. 3.
4 Keble, Tract 4, ibid., p. 1.
5 Loc. cit.
6 Ibid., p. 2.
7 Loc. cit.
8 Ibid., p. 3. Keble argues also from "probability".
9 Bowden, Tract 5, ibid., p. 10.
The doctrine is spoken of as being "undeniable as a fact", "most reasonable as a doctrine", and "sufficiently countenanced in Scripture for its practical reception".1

Again the doctrine is argued for on the basis of Butler's argument for probability. The argument, in fine, is that if there is a likelihood that the holding of Apostolic Succession will please Christ more than not holding it, the doctrine ought to be held.2 Further, the mark of a true pastor is said to be "an external call and mission, from the Apostolic authority of Bishops".3 Thus Apostolic Succession is said to have been the authority of Timothy and Titus.4

Further, assurance is given that the present bishops of the Anglican Church are actual successors of the Apostles; "... the Bishops are Apostles to us, from their witnessing Christ and their suffering for Him."5 It is stated that even if it is argued that the power of ordination was given "to the whole body of disciples; i.e. the Church",6 and that, therefore, the power of ordination at first rested in the

3 Wilson, Tract 42, ibid., p. 2.
4 Bowden, Tract 5, ibid., p. 12.
5 Newman, Tract 10, ibid., p. 4.
6 Newman, Tract 7, ibid., p. 3.
the Church, still it must of necessity be exercised through bishops since "the Church certainly has from the first committed it to the Bishops, and as [has] never resumed it". ¹ Therefore, the Presbyterian ministry is spoken of as being in error because it has assumed to exercise the power of ordination, thus perpetuating a succession of ministers without having received a commission to do so.²

Thus the very existence of the Church is made to be dependent upon Apostolic Succession, for as Tract 15 (which is a combined effort of Newman and Palmer) explains, the Church is a body consisting of clergy and laity, the two classes being distinguished from one another and united by a commandment of God Himself.

... the clergy have a commission from GOD ALMIGHTY through a regular succession from the Apostles, to preach the Gospel, administer the Sacraments, and guide the Church ... in consequence the people are bound to hear them with attention, receive the Sacrament from their hands, and pay them all dutiful obedience.³

Hence, without Apostolic Succession, the Church which Christ founded could no longer be said to be found on earth.

² Ibid., p. 2.
⁴ Bowden, Tract 5, ibid., p. 11.
The doctrine is argued for from the point of Scripture, and from the history of the primitive Church. It is defended by the scholastic type of argument. It is alluded to in Pusey’s tract on Baptism, and is given its highest apology by Newman’s Tract 74 in which he quotes from the writings of forty-three different Archbishops, doctors, presbyters and confessors, from Bishop Bilson to Bishop Mant. The list includes such names as Hooker, Bancroft, Andrews, Pearson, Stillingfleet and Beveridge, all the Anglicans supposed to have favoured the doctrine.

Thus, in giving significance to the existence of the Church in maintaining that the "Visible Church is a standing body", an institution which has concrete existence in the world, which is Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, the one doctrine in which the Tractarians rooted the whole of Church doctrine was that of Apostolic Succession. Throughout the Tracts it is the pivot on which the whole Church turns. It is the line that holds the Church fast to its mooring. It

1 Harrison, Tract 16, ibid., pp. 1-3; Newman, Tract 45, ibid., pp. 1-6.
4 Pusey, Tract 67, IIa, ibid., 87.
6 Newman, Tract 2, I, ibid., 1-4; Tract 47, II, ibid., 1 ff.
is the one guarantee that the Church is a Church, the guarantee that its ministers are ministers of Christ, that its sacraments are valid, that in Baptism sins are forgiven and that in the Eucharist the elements are the Blood and Body of Christ, and it is the one thing without which the Church has no assurance that it is a Church. It is of the Church's essence.

Apostolic Succession was the one doctrine that enabled the Church to be what the Tractarians felt it had to become, an institution with a palpable guarantee of existence which would place it outside the realm of relativity in order to withstand the attacks of the State on the one hand and liberal theology or Rationalism on the other. Thus the revival of the Church in the Oxford Movement hangs upon a law, invariable and inexorable, a rationalistic principle. Hence,


2 Storr states: "No reader of the Tracts can fail to see that the essence of Tractarianism lies in this doctrine of the succession." Storr, op. cit., p. 260.


4 Newman, Tract 73, III, ibid., 1 ff.

5 Nationalism is here used in the sense of a single postulated principle, concept, or doctrine being made the ground of validity for all related concepts or doctrines. To this ground-principle all valid principles must be associated by a cause and effect nexus. Cf. Baldwin, editor, op. cit., II, 415 f. Newman, himself, understood the dan-
the movement which began with Romanticism found its justification, its guarantee of existence in Rationalism.

In the first instance, as Newman indicates,\(^1\) the doctrine of Apostolic Succession was adopted clearly as a stopgap principle. It was thought necessary to give the Church independence in order to ward off the State. It was erected to stem the tide, and, at the opening of the movement, it was argued for not from Scriptural or historical evidence, but on the grounds of probability.\(^2\)

Hence, the doctrine that was adopted as a matter of practical necessity became the foundation on which the entire existence of the Church was made to depend. The prop that was set in place as a matter of expediency became the pillar on to which the entire weight of the Church was transferred. The doctrine of Apostolic Succession which held sway in the Medieval Church formed the basis of the Tractarians' effort to re-catholicize the Anglican Church. It was the doctrine on which the movement was based and from which it received its focus; it was the cohesive force that held the movement

gers of Rationalism and the impropriety of validating all truth by means of cause and effect relationship, (Cf. Newman, Tract 73, III, op. cit., 2 f.) but he was not aware that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as understood by the Tractarians represented exactly what he in his argument opposing Rationalism polemized against.

\(^1\) Cf. ante pp. 17 ff.

together; it was the principle which the movement presupposed and hence which coloured all its historical investigation. Thus against the Rationalism of Church, University, and State, the Oxford Movement adopted a Rationalism of its own.

Note A

Tradition and Scripture

Though the Tractarians have a formal "high view" of the Scriptures, maintaining they are the "supreme authority", that the authority of the Church depends on Scripture, and that they contain all things necessary for salvation, their

1 Fairbairn states: "There is no more splendid example anywhere of how completely a professedly historical movement can be independent of historical truth." Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 311.

2 This same Rationalism is evident in the later Oxford Movement's attitude toward the Scripture in order to hold them aloft from criticism and is exemplified by Pusey's sermon on "Unscience". Liddon, op. cit., IV, 330. It is also exemplified by Liddon's Bamton Lectures of 1866 which were printed under the title, The Divinity of Our Lord. Against this later aspect of the Oxford Movement Gore was to rebel. Charles Gore, Lux Mundi (Twelfth Edition; London: John Murray, 1891), p. viii. Prestige, op. cit., pp. 99, 101, 105.

3 At a later date protecting them against the claims of criticism. Cf. Note 2.

4 Manning and Marriott, Tract 78, IV, op. cit., 2.

5 Pusey, An Eirenicon, p. 95.

6 [Wilson], Tract 44, I, op. cit., 1.
regard for tradition is at least equally "high". They maintain that there is tradition behind and taken for granted by the New Testament writers,\(^1\) that there are apostolic traditions parallel to apostolic writings and of equal authority,\(^2\) and that Scripture is to be interpreted by tradition.\(^3\) Most important, tradition is held to be the source of doctrine and Scripture its proof.\(^4\) Hence the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is based upon the writings of Ignatius,\(^5\) Scripture providing only faint traces of the doctrine,\(^6\) probable evidence,\(^7\) "indirect" evidence,\(^8\) or sufficient countenance for its reception.\(^9\)

\(^1\) Harrison, Tract 24, \textit{ibid.}, p. 2.
\(^2\) Pusey, \textit{An Epiranicon}, p. 86.
\(^5\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 50.
\(^6\) Newman, Tract 8, I, \textit{op. cit.}, 1.
\(^7\) Keble, Tract 4, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 1 ff. Harrison, Tract 24, \textit{ibid.}, p. 10.
\(^8\) Newman, Tract 45, \textit{ibid.}, p. 6.
Note B

Newman's Romanticism

Though Newman was the first of the Oxford group to propagate the rationalistic doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and though in his going over to the Roman Communion he placed himself under a rationalistic system of dogmatic authority, he nevertheless remained a thoroughgoing Romantic.

Newman has given ample evidence to indicate that he had no intention of going to Rome when the Oxford Movement began. The object of the Tractarians was to catholicize the existing Anglican Church, to make it an ideal Catholic Church system omitting the Popery of the Roman Communion. Therefore, Newman can say: "These doctrines are in one sense as entirely new as Christianity when first preached", and "The Via Media, viewed as an integral system, has scarcely had existence except on paper."

2 An act which is considered to have ended the Oxford Movement, at least in its initial phase. Church, op. cit., p. 340.
3 Newman, Apologia, p. 52.
4 Froude had written: "We are Catholics without Popery, and Church-of-England men without the Protestantism." Froude, Remains, I, 404.
5 Newman, Difficulties Felt by Anglicans, p. 33.
In 1839 Newman, referring to the current opinion of the day, wrote: "It points everywhere to Dogmatism, to Mysticism, or to Asceticism; it points on one side to Popery, to another to Pantheism, on the other to Democracy; it does not point to the schools of the Reformation."¹ Again: "The spirit of Luther is dead; but Hildebrand and Loyola are alive."² Therefore, Newman was trying to steer a path between Liberalism on the one hand and Popery on the other.³ But convinced by the onslaught that followed his writing of Tract 90 (in which he frankly attempted to interpret the Thirty-nine Articles as not opposing Catholic teaching but only partially opposing Roman Dogma)⁴ that he was more in line with the Roman Communion than with his own,⁵ and that, as he later expresses it, it would be impossible to change the Establishment into a Church "without a miracle",⁶ Newman went over to the Roman Communion. This transpired in October, 1845, the difficulties in seceding from his own Church having been cleared away in the process of his

¹ Newman, Essays Critical and Historical, p. 305.
³ Newman, Apologia, p. 103.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 79 ff.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 114 ff., 220 ff.
⁶ Newman, Difficulties Felt by Anglicans, p. 57.
writing his Essay on the Development of Doctrine.\(^1\)

An insight into Newman's reason for going to Rome as well as his criteria of truth can be seen from a short examination of his philosophy. His philosophy can be described as a quest for a sound epistemology.\(^2\) According to Newman, as we apprehend phenomena with our senses,\(^3\) we apprehend God with our conscience,\(^4\) and know certitude by an "Illative Sense".\(^5\) The "Illative Sense" is man's ratiocinative faculty\(^6\) which provides both certitude\(^7\) and its own test of truth.\(^8\) It is the capacity of judging and concluding in matters of duty, social intercourse and taste,\(^9\) a power enabling man to make decisions.

---

1 Newman, Apologia, p. 234. This was later published under the title, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.
4 Ibid., p. 63.
5 Ibid., p. 345. Newman distrusted the then current trust in reason as a criterion of truth because he recognized that the conclusions of reason were only as valid as were the first principles upon which reason was based; hence his rejection of both syllogisms and logic as guides to truth. Ibid., pp. 269 ff.
6 Ibid., p. 345.
7 Loc. cit.
8 Ibid., p. 359.
9 Ibid., p. 353.
in all concrete situations whether of science, law or morals, but applied in different measures dependent on the subject matter. The Illative Sense comprises the whole of the reasoning procedure: the choice of the initial assumptions as well as the process of scrutinizing, sorting and combining the many premises which are taken into consideration in making any one decision; further "it is a rule unto itself, and appeals to no judgment beyond its own". Hence, "there is no ultimate test of truth besides the testimony born to truth by the mind itself".

Conscience, for Newman, is man's capability for apprehending knowledge, especially knowledge of God. It provides man with the ability to know what God is and supplies for the mind the real image of God as a medium of worship as well as

---

1 Ibid., p. 355.

2 Ibid., pp. 356, 358.

3 Ibid., p. 361. It is of interest to note that in his unfavorable critique of Rationalism, Newman states that one of the characteristics of Rationalism is that "our private judgment is made every thing to us,--is contemplated, recognized, and referred to as the arbiter of all questions, and as independent of every thing external to us". Newman, Tract 73, III, op. cit., 4. This would seem to be almost a critique of his own position. This "being a rule unto itself" is another characteristic of the Romantic. As F. Schlegel reports in discussing the Romantic, "the will or caprice of the poet admits of no law above itself!". Baldwin, editor, op. cit., II, 479.

4 Newman, Grammar of Assent, p. 350. Newman was, however, convinced that absolute certainty was not possible on earth. Mozley, op. cit., II, 311. Letter dated 1840.
providing divine rules of conduct and a code of moral duties.\footnote{1}{Newman, \textit{Grammar of Assent}, pp. 389 f.}

In addition, Newman's philosophy comprises the principle that the more closely man obeys the dictates of his conscience, the greater its capacity for truth becomes.\footnote{2}{Ibid., p. 390.} Hence, Newman is enclosed in a circle of subjective moralism leading to asceticism.\footnote{3}{Ibid., p. 347. Newman says: "My ideas are all assumptions, and I am ever moving in a circle. I cannot avoid being sufficient for myself, for I cannot make myself anything else, and to change me is to destroy me." \textit{Loc. cit.}\ Cf. H. V. Houth, \textit{Towards the Twentieth Century} (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), pp. 51 ff.} The conscience apprehends knowledge of God as well as an ethical code; to the degree that the conscience is obeyed, it is able to apprehend. Thus the true is the moral and vice versa.\footnote{4}{Newman, \textit{Tract 45}, I, \textit{op. cit.}, 2.} Hence, whoever has the mind of Christ "has holiness and righteousness within him";\footnote{5}{John Henry Newman, \textit{Parochial and Plain Sermons}, V (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891), 138.} likewise, Newman's concept of salvation is profoundly affected by his moralism. Salvation, a gradual process,\footnote{6}{Ibid., pp. 141 f.} depends on man's co-operation with God;\footnote{7}{Ibid., pp. 140 f.} justification is inward work;\footnote{8}{John Henry Newman, \textit{Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification} (Third Edition; London: Rivingtons, 1874), p. 57.} those "counted worthy"
of righteousness "are worthy"; some persons are more "pleasant", "acceptable", or "righteous", before God than others; and the glorification of the cross is "converting body and soul into a sacrifice".

Therefore, in spite of the fact that he insists on dogma and criticizes the Liberals for being anti-dogmatic, for Newman the one great note of the Church is its moral tone, its sanctity, or its ethos which his romantic eye sees in Roman Catholicism. He writes:

It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing; whatever be a religious body's relations to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting... If the Established Church of Scotland has this Note, I will hope all good things of it; if the Roman Church in Ireland has it not, I can hope no good of it. And in like manner, in our own Church, I will unite with all persons as brethren, who have this Note, without any distinction of party.

---

1 Ibid., p. 71.
2 Ibid., p. 152.
3 Ibid., p. 178.
Again, referring to the Church in a letter to Mozley, Newman asserts:

Outward circumstances, or conditions of its presence, may change or not, the Pope may be sovereign one day or a subject another; primus inter pares in early times, the episcopus episcoporum now; there might be no devotions to the Blessed Virgin formerly, they may be superabundant of late; the Holy Eucharist might be a bare commemoration in the first century, and a sacrifice in the nineteenth (of course I have my own definite and precise convictions on these points, but they are nothing to the purpose here, when I want to confine myself to patent facts, which no one ought to dispute); but I say, even supposing there have been changes in doctrine and polity, still the ethos of the Catholic Church is what it was of old time, and whatever and whoever quarrels with Catholicism now, quarrels virtually, and would have quarrelled, if alive 1800 years ago, with the Christianity of the Apostles and Evangelists.

Therefore, Newman's real reason for going over to the Roman Catholic Communion was not that the Roman Church incorporated correct doctrine, but, as Dean Church points out:

... what won his heart and his enthusiasm was one thing; what justified itself to his intellect was another. And it was the reproduction, partial as it might be, yet real and characteristic, in the Ro-

---

1 As quoted by Henri Bremond, The Mystery of Newman (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907), p. 345. Bremond also notes that Mozley, to whom this letter was addressed, published it in the Contemporary Review (September, 1899). Loc. cit.
man Church of the life and ways of the New Testament, which was the irresistible attraction that tore him from the associations and the affections of half a lifetime.¹

It was Romanticism and its corollary asceticism that moved Newman to Rome.²


² Sister Mary Kiener asserts: "... monasticism, or asceticism of the early Fathers, was the magnet that drew the heart of Newman to its natural resting place." Kiener, op. cit., p. 27.
CHAPTER II

BIBLICAL-CRITICAL AND IDEALISTIC THOUGHT

As has been stated, a second factor by which Gore was influenced was that of the schools of Biblical criticism. Gore's contribution to Lux Mundi, which represents a position which he held in the main for his entire life, indicates plainly his acceptance of much of the Biblical-critical thought of the century into which he was born. It is, therefore, necessary for us to review something of the thought of the leading lights of the Biblical-critical movement.

S. T. Coleridge

In Britain, Biblical criticism received much of its inspiration from the religious idealism of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. His works were well-known at Oxford after the first

---

1 Prestige speaking of Gore's being appointed to the head of Pusey House when only 31 years of age states: "Gore was extraordinarily mature." "He made up his mind amazingly early about almost every question of importance." G. L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1935), p. 66.


quarter of the century,\textsuperscript{1} and, as already indicated, Newman, though he avowedly disagreed with many of Coleridge's conclusions, felt a certain debt to him because, as he expressed it, Coleridge "installed a higher philosophy into inquiring minds than they had hitherto been accustomed to accept".\textsuperscript{2}

Coleridge, who in his early life was a Unitarian\textsuperscript{3} but eventually became Trinitarian,\textsuperscript{4} then even goes so far as to say that "Unitarianism is not Christianity",\textsuperscript{5} lays out the heart of his philosophy in his Aids to Reflection, a book intended for ministerial students.\textsuperscript{6} The position with which Coleridge comes to the work, as he states in the Preface, is that the Christian faith, which he considers to include every article of belief and doctrine professed in common by the first Reformers, "is THE PERFECTION OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE".\textsuperscript{7} For Coleridge, the one art of which every man should be a master was that of reflection\textsuperscript{8} and reflection for Coleridge was Self-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Cf. Chap. I, ante p. 7, note 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} S. T. Coleridge, Aids to Reflection (London: George Routledge & Sons, Limited, [n. d.]), p. vi.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Loc. cit.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 151, note 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p. xii.
  \item \textsuperscript{7} Loc. cit.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Ibid., p. xvi.
\end{itemize}
Knowledge. The possession of self-knowledge not only distinguished man from the animal, but also provided him with the key for unlocking the subjects for reflection or discussion as well as the treasures provided by revelation.¹

Coleridge's Philosophy

The maxim, "Know thyself",² was of utmost importance for Coleridge because of his epistemological conceptions. These form the basis for his philosophy, which is of importance both because it formed the background for his theological opinions into which fit his concepts of Biblical criticism, and because it was one of the fountainheads of the Romanticism of the Oxford Movement as well as of the Idealism of which Gore was to later partake.³

Coleridge believed man possessed within himself a capacity by which he was both in direct contact with and could apprehend reality. This capacity is variously referred to as "an immortal Soul",⁴ the "Divine Light",⁵ "the Spirit of

¹ Loc. cit.
² Loc. cit.
⁴ Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 86. The soul is said to have descended from heaven. Cf. Ibid., p. 266.
⁵ Ibid., p. 276.
"God", "a Holy Spirit" which abides within us, "a reflecting mind", "the Conscience", but most comprehensively, the Reason.

"Reason", the greatest term in Coleridge's philosophy, is spoken of as "the Image of God in us", a capability which is itself light, with which God has endowed man to behold the divine light, or a capacity by which we recognize the existence of God. In man reason is "an intuition or immediate Beholding, accompanied by a conviction of the necessity and universality of the beheld... when it is construed by pure Sense, gives birth to the Science of Mathematics, and when applied to Objects supersensuous or spiritual is the Organ of Theology and Philosophy". Further, it is that capacity which "affirms truths which no Sense could perceive, nor Experiment verify,

1 Ibid., p. 63.
2 Ibid., p. 100.
4 Ibid., pp. 85, 95. Cf. Ibid., pp. 112 f.
5 Ibid., p. 101.
7 Ibid., p. 264, note.
8 Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 169, note.
nor experience confirm". 1

Coleridge does not, however, confine reason to man. Following Plato of whom he speaks only in the highest terms, 2 he refers to it as the ground of being. The self-subsistent reason is "the Logos". 3 Thence, though it is present with man, man can "as little appropriate it, whether, totally or by partition, as he can claim ownership in the breathing air or make an inclosure in the cope of heaven". 4 It is the "source of Ideas", 5 "Reason is the Power of Universal and necessary Convictions, the Source and Substance of Truths above Sense, and having their evidence in themselves." 6 And, though in man it is "the life or indwelling of the living word", 7 the "integral spirit of regenerated man", 8 it is "one only, yet manifold, overseeing all and going through all, understanding, the breath of the power of God, and a pure in-

1 Loc. cit.


4 Ibid., p. 266.

5 Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, Appendix, p. 315, note.

6 Ibid., p. 154.


8 Ibid., p. 266.
fluence from the glory of the Almighty; which remaining in itself regenerated all other powers, and in all ages entering into holy souls maketh them friends of God and prophets".1 Contemplated objectively, reason is Being, the "Supreme Being".2 It is the "Word" or "Logos".3 For Coleridge, the supreme reason is God Himself.4 God, though he has "independent (extra-mundane) existence and personality",5 is "the One before all, and of all, and through all",6 the "plus or universal which man as the minus or individual finds his correlative pole".7

Religion, as Coleridge sees it, has its source in reason; reason and religion differing only in the "two-fold application of the same power".8 In that religion in general is one with pure reason, the religion of the individual has its being in the universal.9 Hence, it is the reasonableness of Chris-

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., p. 265, note.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 264.
5 Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 114.
7 Ibid., p. 269, note.
8 Ibid., p. 258.
9 Ibid., pp. 259 f.
tianity that makes it superior over all other faiths.¹

Further, for Coleridge, religion is inexorably bound up with morality.² The purpose of religion is to improve man, to make him fit for the Kingdom.³ Hence, morality is of the essence of religion.⁴ A religious man is a moral man.⁵ Thus, it is the purpose of the Scriptures to teach duty,⁶ for "Christianity is not a Theory nor a Speculation, but a Life".⁷

Coleridge maintains that the method of religion is that of discipline. The world is at variance with the divine form or idea;⁸ immorality and intemperance obstruct the way and motion of the Spirit of God in the soul;⁹ therefore, the soul must free itself from the disturbances of the world and convert itself toward God;¹⁰ man must form anew the divine image of the soul.¹¹ For Coleridge the disciplines of the mind and

¹ Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 101.
² Ibid., pp. 37 f.
³ Ibid., p. 131.
⁴ Ibid., p. 13.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 52, 68 f.
⁶ Ibid., p. 121.
⁷ Ibid., p. 143.
⁸ Ibid., p. 11.
⁹ Ibid., p. 63.
¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17.
¹¹ Ibid., p. 12.
will and affection are necessary to the design of redemption from the form of the evil one and to the second creation in the divine image.¹

Thus Coleridge purports that though the image of God is in man, and the Spirit of God within him, it has not taken complete possession of man. He maintains that the process of becoming moral is effected by the application of discipline to expand the capacities which man has already. Hence, the state of religious morality is progressive.² He avows that man should attempt to form a reflecting mind after the divine image,³ for regeneration is the "self subjection" to the universal light resulting in the will of the individual becoming the "will of reason".⁴ "The reason [in its full sense] is the Spirit of the regenerated man, whereby the Person is capable of quickening inter-communion with the Divine Spirit."⁵

Religion is not only to make man better in the sense of behaviour, but its object is also the improvement of the nature and faculties of man.⁶ Christianity cleanses the heart and

---

¹ Ibid., p. 21.
² Ibid., p. 67.
³ Ibid., p. 10.
⁴ Ibid., p. 155.
⁵ Loc. cit.
⁶ Ibid., p. 133.
restores the intellect likewise to its natural clearness. Coleridge states: "Too soon did the Doctors of the Church forget that the Heart, the Moral Nature, was the beginning and the end; that the Truth, Knowledge, and Insight were comprehended in its expansion."  

Hence, for Coleridge, morality and the discernment of truth are integrally connected. All doctrine must come under the judgment of reason and conscience. For in that both reason and religion have the same source, both being gifts of God, they cannot contradict one another or oppose each other. Further, since morality is necessary to apprehend spiritual truth, the most pious conclusion is the most legitimate. Coleridge holds that both metaphysics and the Church as well as Church doctrines are of absolute necessity. He

---

2 Ibid., p. 134.
3 Conscience, according to Coleridge, is "the mind of a man under the notion of a particular reference to himself and his own actions". Ibid., p. 83.
4 Ibid., p. 144.
5 Ibid., p. 261.
6 Ibid., p. 113. Note the similarity to Newman, Chp. 1, ante, p. 33.
7 Ibid., p. 48. Cf. Ibid., p. 100.
8 Coleridge calls the Church "the shrine of Morality". Ibid., p. 220.
9 Ibid., p. 237, note.
Christianity without a Church exercising Spiritual Authority, is Vanity and Dissolution.† Nevertheless, for him, all things have to be judged by reason. "If Reason justly contradicts an article, it is not of the household of Faith".‡ Nothing can be allowed as true for the human mind that contradicts reason.†§

Against the Deists Coleridge maintains that it is illegitimate to attempt to contemplate the spiritual or supernatural in the forms of the space and time,⁵ that spiritual truths are only spiritually discernible.⁶ And against the "over zealous" who feel they receive a direct revelation from God,⁷ he insists that the final appeal must be to reason,⁸ that

---

1 Ibid., p. 225, note.
2 Ibid., p. 260.
3 Ibid., p. 120.
4 Cf. Ibid., pp. 54, 87, 93.
5 Ibid., p. 47.
6 Ibid., p. 44. Coleridge also maintains that eternity is absolute and time is conditional. The eternal alone is considered objectively, universally true. Ibid., p. 236, note. Again, man's reason is the supernatural capacity by which he can apprehend the supernatural. Coleridge, Statesman's Manual, pp. 285 f., note. Cf. Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, pp. 101, 108.
7 Ibid., pp. 101, 105. Cf. Ibid., pp. 297 f.
8 Ibid., p. 230.
everyone must give reason for his faith.¹

Thus Coleridge feels that he fulfills his object of providing a general rule of interpretation and vindication applicable to all doctrinal tenets and mysteries of the Christian faith.² By use of the Platonic concept of reason common to both God and man, he has rid himself of differentiations in kind between Supernatural and Natural, between Reason and Faith, between truth per se, and its apprehension by moral man. He holds to the Faith because he can say: "For the Light within me, that is, my Reason and Conscience, does assure me, that the Ancient and Apostolic Faith according to the historical Meaning thereof, and the literal sense of the Creed is solid and true".³

Coleridge's Biblical-Critical Thought

As stated, Coleridge gave direct impetus to the science of Biblical criticism. He avows: "The Gospel is not a system of Theology, nor a Syntagma of theoretical propositions and conclusions for the enlargement of speculative knowledge, ethical or metaphysical. But it is a History, a series of

---

¹ Ibid., p. 100.
² Ibid., p. 109.
³ Ibid., pp. 98 f.
Facts and Events related or announced. It is the "Word of God".

It was Coleridge's observations on Scriptures themselves that led naturally to his giving impetus to Biblical criticism. He writes:

It is worthy of especial observation, that the Scriptures are distinguished from all other writings pretending to inspiration, by the strong and frequent recommendations of knowledge, and a spirit of inquiry. Without reflection, it is evident that neither the one can be acquired nor the other exercised.

Thus, he sees it as absolutely necessary to the understanding of Scriptures that the reader should exercise his reflection upon them to find out their meaning for him. He would detect the meanings and the double meanings of the words, to do away with sophism and instil the habit of using words appropriately with a distinct knowledge of their primary, derivative, and metaphorical senses. Coleridge was most anxious to underline the importance of specific word usage.

Though Coleridge's interest in both the Scriptures and

1 Ibid., p. 145.
2 Ibid., p. 130.
3 Ibid., p. 3.
4 Cf. Ibid., pp. 12, 130.
5 Ibid., p. xiii. Cf. Ibid., pp. 6, 104.
language gave impetus to his interest in Biblical criticism, this was not a native growth in its entirety. He spent nearly a year in Germany just at the turn of the century acquainting himself with German language and literature.1 Referring to this year spent in Germany, V. F. Storr states: "From Eichhorn Coleridge learned some of the principles of literary criticism of the Bible. From Lessing, whose influence upon him at one period was immense, he received an insight into the meaning of historical development."2

Coleridge's thought in reference to Biblical criticism was portended in both Aids to Reflection3 and The Statesman's Manual,4 but he set out his conclusions in unmistakable language in Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit, which was published in 1840, four years after his death. In this writing Coleridge contends that if the Bible is to be properly understood, it must be looked upon without prejudice and read as any other book.5 He insists that the Bible should be taken

---

1 Ibid., p. vi.
2 Storr, op. cit., p. 193.
3 Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, pp. 60, 101.
as a whole\textsuperscript{1} and that each book should be seen as a whole as complete in itself, but yet as an integral part of the entire canon.\textsuperscript{2} He rejects as superstitious and unscriptural the doctrine that the letters and articulated sounds by which the word of God is communicated to our human apprehensions in the Bible are divinely communicated.\textsuperscript{3} He feels that the doctrine that the Scriptures are dictated in word and thought by an infallible intelligence petrifies the body of Holy Writ\textsuperscript{4} which he considers to be the work of one Holy Spirit working diversely.\textsuperscript{5} He maintains that the absolute infallibility of the inspired writers is no part of their purpose,\textsuperscript{6} and that a belief in absolute infallibility leads to ridiculous attempts to harmonize discrepancies in the record,\textsuperscript{7} neutralizes the criteria by which one may judge the validity of the contents of historical documents,\textsuperscript{8} and is the cause of "forced and fantastic interpretations, the arbitrary allegories and mystic ex-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Coleridge, \textit{Confessions}, p. 294.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 299.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 305.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 306.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}Ibid., p. 331.
  \item \textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 309.
  \item \textsuperscript{8}Loc. cit.
\end{itemize}
pansion of proper names". 1 Thus interpreted, incidents are "detached from their context, and, contrary to the intention of the sacred writer, first raised into independent theses, and then brought together to produce or sanction some new credendum for which neither separately could have furnished a pretence". 2

Coleridge's demand for the Bible is only the justice due, other books of great authority, to other proved and acknowledged benefactors of mankind. 3 He feels that the Bible has nothing to lose and everything to gain from an unbiased attitude towards it. 4 "The Truth revealed through Christ has its evidence in itself, and the proof of its divine authority in its fitness to our nature and needs." 5 In rejecting the popular belief in verbal infallibility 6 and in carrying out his purpose to convince himself and others that the Bible and Christianity are their own sufficient evidence, 7 he states: "The Bible, considered in reference to its declared ends and

---

1 Ibid., p. 313.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., p. 317.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., p. 319.
6 Coleridge maintains it is "present and popular belief". Ibid., p. 318.
7 Ibid., p. 300.
purposes, is true and holy, and for all who seek truth with humble spirits and unquestionable guide, and therefore it is the Word of God.\(^1\)

Relating his own experience with the Scriptures, Coleridge writes: "I have met everywhere more or less copious sources of truth, and power, and purifying impulses."\(^2\) His assurance that the Bible is inspired rests on his experience with it. He says:

... I have found words for my inmost thoughts, songs for my joy, utterances for my hidden griefs, and pleadings for my shame and my feebleness ... In short whatever finds me, bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit, even from the same Spirit, which remaining in itself, yet regenerateth all other powers, and in all ages entering into holy souls maketh them friends of God, and prophets.\(^3\)

For Coleridge, the objective revelation of the Bible contains all truths necessary to salvation,\(^4\) and, therefore, it contains "the undoubted Word of God."\(^5\) It communicates "objective truth."\(^6\) Coleridge holds his position not because of some inflexible doctrine of infallibility, but because he

---

1 Ibid., p. 323.
2 Ibid., p. 294.
3 Ibid., p. 295.
5 Ibid., p. 330.
6 Ibid., p. 336.
maintains that the Spirit which inspired the writers of the Scripture bears witness to the spirit of the reader.1

Thomas Arnold

Thomas Arnold, a contemporary of Coleridge, in his "Essay on the Right Interpretation and Understanding of the Scriptures" lays down his "general rules of interpretation".2 These, he indicates, should be borne in mind throughout the study of the Scriptures. By this contribution he furthered the progress of the Biblical-critical thought which was to be introduced into Anglo-Catholic theology some fifty years later.

Arnold's point of departure was the contradiction that he saw to exist between the criteria utilized for the interpretation of Scriptures on the one hand and those employed in other areas of investigation on the other. He points out that the educated mind which has been taught to seek truth in other realms is constantly perplexed when seeing the "obscurities", "apparent contradictions", and that which the reader would feel to be "immoralities" in the Scriptural text.3

Arnold apologizes for his "Biblical-critical" interest by

1 Loc. cit.


3 Ibid., p. 378.
It seems to me, then, to be a work of great usefulness to endeavour to meet the wants of a mind so circumstanced,—to present such a view of the Scripture revelation as may enable a young man to read his Bible not only without constant perplexity, but with immense and increasing comfort and benefit.\textsuperscript{1}

He maintains that the theologian's job is two-fold, "the interpretation of the Scriptures, and the application of them".\textsuperscript{2} The first he considers to be a matter of criticism and philology.\textsuperscript{3} Thus he welcomes "every work that increases our knowledge of the languages in which the Scriptures were written; that assists us to fix the age and circumstances of the authors of the several books; or that throws light on the state of their times, in all its various divisions".\textsuperscript{4} The second task demanded of the theologian is a complete knowledge of his own times.\textsuperscript{5}

Arnold had a high opinion of the value of Scripture and laments the fact that theological education had neither paid enough attention to the Scriptures as the central object of theological study, nor had it instituted methods of proper

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 380.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Arnold, Sermons, III, (Third Ed.), viii.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Loc. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid., pp. viii f.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. ix.
\end{itemize}
interpretation. He asserts: "Far too little attention has been paid to the complete interpretation of the Scriptures on the one hand, and to the studies required for the actual application of them on the other."¹ He regrets that the study of Hebrew in England is neither required of candidates for ordination nor as a qualification for degrees in theology at the universities.² His basic respect for the Scriptures is again indicated by his judgment that the essentials of Christianity will be found from the Scriptures when they are examined carefully by the unbiased student.³

Though Arnold has a high conception of the Scriptures, his opinion of man's reason is, at least, on an equal level. Reason is the capacity with which man seeks truth. Therefore, when considering the Scriptures, the demands of reason must be satisfied. He writes:

... intellectual wisdom, which exercises over this world more than imperial dominion, may not be denied her lawful tribute. It is within her province to judge all questions of science, of history, and of criticism, according to her own laws; nor may her decision on these matters be disputed by an appeal to

¹ Ibid., p. xxii.
³ Arnold, Sermons, III, xxiii. "... the true way of reasoning ... assumes nothing beforehand as to the necessity of this or that doctrine, but examines the view of Christianity which God Himself has given." Loc. cit.
the higher power of spiritual wisdom, who leaves such points wholly to her lower jurisdiction.¹

Thus Arnold indicates dismay at the halo of untouchability with which the popular mind of his time was apt to clothe spiritual and religious matters.² Therefore, while admitting the comparative worthlessness of all "merely intellectual exercises"³ and criticizing the German scholars for divorcing themselves from Christian practice and hence falling into the intellectual fault of over-scepticism,⁴ he, nevertheless, demands that men use their powers of judgment in interpreting the Scriptures. He writes:

"He that is spiritual judges all things:" all things, save the very principles of the spiritual wisdom from which his power of judgment is derived . . . he will seek truth only, sure that whatever it may be, it must turn to the glory of God.⁵

For Arnold, "God is the God of truth".⁶

Arnold's principles of exegesis stem from his theory that God "accomodates" his revelation to man.⁷ He maintains that God does not convey reality as such but only so much of it as

---

² Ibid., pp. 425 f.
³ Ibid., p. 426.
⁴ Ibid., p. 433.
⁵ Ibid., p. 427.
⁶ Ibid., p. 426.
⁷ Ibid., p. 384. This concept was also used by Coleridge in reference to the account of Abraham's being commanded to sacrifice Issac. Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 60.
is expedient for man at any particular moment to know.\(^1\) It is on this process of accommodation that Arnold bases his concept of the progressive character of revelation in the Scriptures.\(^2\) He maintains that both in knowledge and in moral conduct man has progressed through several states,\(^3\) and that God's revelations to man, including those related to both knowledge and conduct, were adapted to his state at the particular periods in which they were made. It is for this reason that actions may be commended at one period of revelation and seen at another time to be evil. Thus he, like Coleridge, points out that we can understand that Abraham's being commanded to sacrifice was an actual command considering that in Abraham's day child sacrifices were quite acceptable.\(^4\) However, by the same token, he asserts that sacrifice could not be commanded by God to us since we have now learned from God that "such offerings are an abomination which he hateth".\(^5\)

Thus all revelation, if it is to be understood, must be seen against its own particular background. Further, it must be kept in mind that the process of revelation is that of an

\(^{1}\) Arnold, "Essay on Right Interpretation", Sermons, II, 384.

\(^{2}\) Cf. Storr, op. cit., p. 192.

\(^{3}\) Arnold, "Essay on Right Interpretation", Sermons, II, 387. Cf. ante, p. 44.


\(^{5}\) Arnold, "Essay on Right Interpretation", Sermons, II, 397.
infinite God revealing Himself through finite creatures. Therefore, the revelation must be adapted to the creatures' condition of finiteness.\(^1\)

For Arnold, the revelatory process is illustrated in the Incarnation. In the Incarnation God [Christ] who is termed "Infinity"\(^2\) communed with His finite creatures and conversed with them daily. Christ "must have adapted Himself to their notions, or else He would have altered their nature to something far above humanity. He must have often spoken as a man who possessed no greater knowledge than the men of that time and country".\(^3\)

Thus Biblical criticism had secured a foothold in British theological thought. The movement was so far in the main a constructive movement. Having a traditionally British, and therefore, a healthy respect for the Scriptures, the Biblical critics were able to free the Bible from its fetters by removing its halo of untouchability, and enable students to discover

\(^{1}\) Ibid., pp. 384 f.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., pp. 386.

\(^{3}\) Loc. cit. Like Coleridge, Arnold was also subject to the influence of German scholars. Storr states: "From Niebuhr, for whom he had a profound admiration, and with whom he was personally acquainted, Arnold learned the principles and methods of scientific, historical criticism, and saw that they must be applied to the Bible." Storr, op. cit., p. 190.
its secrets by allowing them to ask it questions. Once free from questioning the Bible came alive. Its language could be questioned and hence new and accurate meanings found for its words. Its authors were seen to be real men writing to actual people in everyday situations, and therefore, its message was seen to be applicable to life rather than an untouchable dogmatic formula. Thus far, at any rate, men's respect for the Bible had been able to hold their philosophies in check so that, in spite of the elevation of reason, the Biblical records and not their subjective interpretations remained the principles to which theology turned. In Britain, at any rate, the historicity and facts of the New Testament were still taken seriously.

However, before Biblical criticism in Britain was to influence Gore, it was to split into two divisions. In one direction, which may be referred to as the "left" or less orthodox side, it was to reach culmination in 1860 in the publication, Essays and Reviews. The more orthodox, or what may be called the "right" side of the school of the Biblical-Critical movement which affected Gore, is that centred in the famous Cambridge scholars—Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort.¹

¹ Knox and Vidler state: "From 1865 onwards the three great Cambridge scholars, Westcott, Hort, and Lightfoot, were the outstanding figures in the theological world of England. They derived from the older Liberals their clear grasp of the fact that the Bible must be studied in the same way as any other body of ancient literature; the meaning of the text
Westcott's thought is of primary interest for our purpose.

B. F. Westcott

In 1844 Brooke Foss Westcott entered Cambridge where he received his university education. Four years later, he took and passed the classical Tripos and immediately thereafter busied himself with private pupils.¹ Among them were J. B. Lightfoot, who like Westcott, had been educated in King Edward VI School, Birmingham, and had gone into residence in Cambridge the previous October,² and F. J. A. Hort.³ With these two men Westcott was to be associated for the rest of their lives, and the three were to form one of the most potent forces in the schools of British Biblical criticism.⁴

Westcott was ordained deacon, June 15, 1851, and priest, December 21 of the same year by his old master, Dr. J. Prince

must be that which the author intended, not that which it has acquired as a proof text of some particular dogma. But to the passion of the older Liberals for the truth they added a firm conviction that, the more the truth is studied, the more fully it will serve to establish the central doctrines of Christianity.⁵ Wilfred L. Knox and Alec R. Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1933), p. 59.

² Ibid., p. 107.
³ Ibid., p. 108.
⁴ Cf. ante, p. 59, note 1.
Lee, Bishop of Manchester,¹ and in January, 1852, he undertook temporary work at Harrow school² where he became an assistant master in March, 1852.³ Fourteen years later in 1866 Westcott still held this position when Charles Gore entered Harrow. The impressions made by Westcott on Gore were to abide and be of a shaping nature in both Gore's life and theology.

Though Westcott received a classical education at Trinity College and had a genuine interest in the Classics,⁴ and though he was neither free from Romantic⁵ nor Neo-Platonic influences,⁶ it is his great respect for Scripture that makes possible his contribution to theological thought in general and to Biblical critical thought in particular. He managed to subordinate his

---

¹ A. Westcott, op. cit., p. 116.
² Ibid., p. 119.
³ Ibid., p. 128. Recorded in a letter to Lightfoot.
⁴ This interest is shown by the subject of some of his papers, (Ibid., p. 47) also by his many references to both Plato and Aristotle in correspondence. Cf. Ibid., pp. 175 f., 260 f.
⁵ He claims Keble as "the true poet" (Ibid., p. 51) stating that one of his verses is worth a volume of Tennyson's. Ibid., p. 100. He also has a great liking for Scott's novels. Ibid., p. 115.
⁶ Fairbairn states of Westcott, "He was a Neo-Platonist of the ecclesiastical rather than of the classical Renaissance. He did not so much seek the Church in philosophy as philosophy in the Church; he came to his Platonism through Clement and Origen, not through Plotinus and Numenius." A. M. Fairbairn, Catholicism: Roman and Anglican (London: Hodder and Stoughten, 1899), p. 395. Westcott also expressed admiration for the li-
philosophical concepts to Scriptural concepts at least to a degree that makes his work positive.¹

To Westcott the Scriptures had a practical as well as academic interest. In correspondence while at Cambridge, he suggests a method of reading Scripture to a Sunday School class to make it more effective.² Recording in his diary his thoughts upon acquiring a Greek Testament at Cambridge, he states: "My Greek Testament comes at last—which I trust may be my companion for many, many years to come. May I not fail to 'Remember,' and in all things to set in it my greatest


¹ As Smedes indicates, Westcott has a strong affinity to the Idealism of F. D. Maurice. L. B. Smedes, The Incarnation: Trends in Modern Anglican Thought (Amsterdam: J. H. Kok N. V. Kampen, 1953), p. 52. It should be pointed out, however, that though Westcott did profoundly agree with Maurice's interest in social reform, and was to a certain extent influenced by him, (A. Westcott, op. cit., II, 160) he also indicates dis¬agreement. Ibid., I, 229. Maurice's influence came comparative¬ly late, certainly after Westcott had formed his basic theolo¬gical and Biblical-critical thought. Westcott had not even read Maurice by July, 1852, (Ibid., p. 224) and expresses sur¬prise when upon reading Maurice's life, he finds himself in sympathy with much of Maurice's characteristic thought. It should be pointed out also that Westcott was somewhat influ¬enced by Compte though this influence also was late and is of a sociological rather than a theological character. Ibid., pp. 262, 331. He also expresses some fear of Comte's ideas. Ibid., p. 213.

² From a letter written to Sarah Louisa Mary Whittard, his future wife. Ibid., p. 65. Westcott, himself, was a Sunday School teacher during his student days. Ibid., p. 49. He also advises his fiancée to check his advice against Holy Scripture before acquiescing to it. Ibid., p. 64.
treasure, my surest comfort; and so may all my friends."\(^1\)

Also, according to his diary, he had already in 1846 began to think about employing his leisure in the preparation of a new edition of the Greek New Testament.\(^2\)

In the year 1850 when only twenty-five years of age, Westcott wrote an essay entitled, "On the Alleged Historical Contradictions of the Gospels". This essay which won the Morrisian prize at the time of its writing\(^3\) was in the second and subsequent printed editions named, An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. In it Westcott lays down the principles of criticism that were to guide him throughout his work. In the notice to its Fourth Edition, Westcott indicates his own attitude toward the Scriptures in stating: "Holy Scripture opens treasures new and old to men and to churches, now as in former times, when the scribe becomes a disciple of the Kingdom of GOD."\(^4\) In pointing to the necessity of interpretive criteria, he declares that it is through the laws of interpretation that Holy Scripture vindicates most completely its claim

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 43.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 42.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 114.

"to be considered as a message of God through men and to men."  

Like Coleridge and Arnold, Westcott is well aware of foreign scholarship and makes mention of the fact that he owes a great debt to the German schools of criticism as well as to Kant, but he rarely accepts their conclusions.

Westcott's position is best described in the Preface to the First Edition of his work, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, wherein he states:

My chief object has been to shew that there is a true mean between the idea of a formal harmonization of the Gospels and the abandonment of their absolute truth. It was certainly an error of the early Harmonists that they endeavoured to fit together the mere facts of the Gospels by mechanical ingenuity; but it is surely no less an error in modern critics, that they hold the perfect truthfulness of Scripture as a matter of secondary moment.

He indicates his method of interpretation in saying of the Gospels that they cannot be studied separately but that their mutual relationships and constructive forces must be taken into consideration and that their teaching should be collected into a great spiritual whole.

1 Ibid., p. xi. Cf. Ibid., p. 15.
2 A. Westcott, op. cit., II, 284.
3 B. F. Westcott, op. cit., p. xii.
4 Ibid., p. xv.
5 Ibid., pp. 14 f.
In reference to what he considers to be the two prevalent types of Biblical interpretation, Westcott points out that the followers of the Reformers had replaced the doctrine of the infallible Church with a belief in the mechanical infallibility of the Scriptures;¹ while at the other extreme those influenced by the achievements of science held the Bible to be "merely the book of the Legends of the Hebrews, which will yield to the skilful inquirer their residuum of truth like those of the Greeks and Romans".² The first of these groups regard the prophet as "the pen and not the perman of the Holy Spirit",³ and the second regard him as a man who simply develops his own germ of truth which he teaches to his fellows.⁴

Rejecting both these views, Westcott maintains that revelation has always a two-fold character which "arises from the combination of the divine influence with the human utterance".⁵ He declares: "Thoughts are wedded to words as necessarily as soul to body."⁶ Thus the book is held to be inspired

¹ Ibid., p. 5.
² Ibid., p. 6.
³ Loc. cit.
⁴ Ibid., p. 7.
⁵ Ibid., p. 13.
⁶ Ibid., p. 14. Westcott received his high appreciation as to the value and power of words from his old schoolmaster, Mr. Lee, in Birmingham. He states: "A word, as he regarded
no less than the prophet.\(^1\)

The Letter becomes as perfect as the Spirit; and it may well seem that the Image of the Incarnation is reflected in the Christian Scriptures, which . . . exhibit the human and divine in the highest form and in the most perfect union.\(^2\)

Like Arnold, Westcott maintains that the Scriptures exhibit an outward development. "The divine teaching, the one, is not uniform. Truth is indeed immutable, but humanity is progressive; and thus the form in which truth is presented must be examined in relation to the age in which the revelation was made."\(^3\) Hence each stage "has its proper and enduring lesson: each record constitutes a link in the golden chain".\(^4\) This truth, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned, is integrally bound up with history. For Westcott, the Gospels, at least, are accurate, historical reports. He asserts that the evangelists "felt truly the inner meaning of the events which they record, and truly told their outward details".\(^5\)

\(^1\) B. F. Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 16.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 16.


\(^5\) Ibid., p. 17.
In order to see Scripture's true meaning Westcott asserts that the writings of the evangelists must be compared as well as analysed and that doctrines must be constructed by the teaching which results from the comparison of scattered passages. He points out that by study the different parts of the Bible are seen to form a unity. Further, in that religious truth is conveyed through the medium of human conception, the word of the interpreter consists in "the strict investigation of the simple meaning of the text, and the development of the religious teaching which lies underneath it". This task includes the study of language and idiom and, in the case of the New Testament, the realization that the interpreter has to do with hebraized Greek which unites the forms of Hebrew thought with the Greek expression. Westcott further asserts that the fact of the New Testament not having been written in a classical language is no hindrance to it. He points out that dialects are as capable a vehicle of truth as formal language, that the apostles spoke with exactness,

1 Ibid., p. 25.
2 Ibid., p. 34.
3 Ibid., p. 37.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., p. 38.
6 Ibid., p. 39.
and that their words conveyed the meaning intended.¹

However, for Westcott, the philological part of interpretation is only half of the work; the Scriptural meaning lies under the text. Westcott calls his view of inspiration, "plenary Inspiration", which "finds its expression in the right relation between partial human knowledge and absolute Divine truth".² Likewise, the interpretation of the Scriptures depends on a relation between the human and the divine. This interpretation is more than a merely mechanical or intellectual process; it depends on the operation of the Spirit of God as well as on the laws of criticism.³ The place of the work of the Bible scholar is, for Westcott, within the Church;⁴ the task is important and concrete for "Revelation is not a vain thing for us; it is our life".⁵

The above indicates the serious attitude which Westcott held for Scripture throughout his ministry. His profound sense for the need of adequate texts led him, while still at

¹ Ibid., p. 40.
² Ibid., p. 41.
³ Ibid., p. 44.
⁴ Loc. cit.
⁵ Ibid., p. 45. Later he was to assert: "It is when the books of the Bible are studied as other books and compared with other books that their unique character is proved beyond controversy." A. Westcott, op. cit., II, 234.
Cambridge, with the co-operation of Hort to begin the work on a revised edition of the Greek New Testament. This was published in 1881. Also his persuasions led him to reject both the scholasticism of the later Tractarians, and the radical liberalism of Essays and Reviews. Writing to Hort he states: "I think it is needful to show that there is a mean between Essays and Reviews and Traditionalism." In a letter to J. B. Lightfoot he indicates that in his opinion Essays and Reviews precipitate a division. He writes: "I think we can make a good position equally removed from sceptical dogmatism and unbelief." Also Westcott proposes that this middle position be worked out as a combined effort.

Upon becoming Bishop of Durham in 1890, Westcott's interests were transferred to the social side of Christianity, an interest which became manifest while he was a Canon at West-

1 The project was initiated in 1853. Ibid., I, 398.

2 This received definition in Liddon's Divinity of Our Lord. Cf. Chp I, ante 27, note 2.

3 A. Westcott, op. cit., I, 213 ff.

4 Letter quoted, Ibid., p. 215. Westcott also recommends the project to F. J. A. Hort. Loc. cit. However, upon Lightfoot's decision that he could not join in the undertaking, the scheme was abandoned. Ibid., p. 216. For reference to a proposed project for the production of a commentary for the whole New Testament by Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort cf. Note A, post p. 71.
minister. He, nevertheless, held to his high view of the Scriptures. Writing to clergymen he objects to the phrase, "The Holy Eucharist will be offered for", being used at the Communion service because this form is not of the Scriptures. Likewise to one who had asked him the meaning of, "Do this", he maintains that in the context in which the words occur they can only mean, "Do this act", and not "Sacrifice this"; nor will he sanction such devotions as the Litany of the Holy Ghost, because they "are wholly without authority from Holy Scripture".

Thus, Westcott's point of reference as far as his theology or practice was concerned was always the New Testament. It is from him that Gore received his respect for the Scriptures as well as his regard for historical facts.

When Westcott left Harrow to be Canon of Peterborough Cathedral in 1869, Gore was one of the monitors who signed a letter of appreciation. In a letter to Arthur Westcott, the

1 Ibid., II, 15. Gore was also influenced by Westcott's interest in social action. Gore joined with Westcott on occasion in the activities of the Christian Social Union of which both Westcott and later Gore were presidents. Cf. Ibid., pp. 182, 198, 211.

2 Letter dated 9, August, 1900. Ibid., p. 349.

3 Ibid., p. 353.

4 Ibid., p. 357.


6 A. Westcott, op. cit. I, 269 f.
author of *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, Gore writes that a sermon of Westcott's entitled, "Disciplined Life", which Westcott had delivered at Harrow, had made a profound impression upon him. Gore also points out that the standard which Westcott set for the instruction of boys in the New Testament was so high that the examination offered might have been set for an honour theology examination at either university.¹

**Essays and Reviews and Benjamin Jowett**

A year after Darwin shocked the world of thought with the publication of his *Origin of Species*, seven members of the Anglican Communion—Frederick Temple, Rowland Williams, Baden Powell, Henry Bristol Wilson, C. W. Goodwin, Mark Pattison and Benjamin Jowett—startled the theological world by the publication of a combined effort entitled, *Essays and Reviews*. The volume is perhaps more noted for its effect than for its content. Knox and Vidler say of it: "In itself, of course, the volume was of trifling importance as compared with the *Origin of Species*; but in the ecclesiastical world

¹ Letter cited, *ibid.*, p. 194. It is interesting to note that on the publication of *Lux Mundi*, Westcott writes to Hort: "$\ldots$ Gore is perfectly able to take care of himself, and it is significant that he has been elected Bampton Lecturer. My fear is that the reaction will go too far." Letter cited, *ibid.*, p. 147.
it aroused a panic. However, though most of the essays of the volume were negative in tone, destructive rather than constructive, it serves the valid purpose of indicating just how far Biblical criticism had penetrated the thought of the Anglican Church by the year 1860.

Incorporating foundations of criticism set out by both Coleridge and Arnold, the essays in general were a plea for the allowance of the use of man's critical faculties in the interpretation of Scripture. Pattison's essay on "The Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750", is an argument for the necessity of free investigation in theology since, according to Pattison, the basis on which revelation is supposed to rest is most indefinite. Baden Powell in his

---


3 Storr, op. cit., p. 446.


5 Cf. ante pp. 47 ff, pp. 53 ff.

6 Storr, op. cit., p. 436.

7 Benjamin Jowett and others, Essays and Reviews (Second Edition; London: John W. Parker and Son, 1860), p. 329.
essay entitled, "Study of the Evidences of Christianity", not only argues for the right of free inquiry and "perfect freedom of conviction", but displays his scientific prejudices by outlawing the possibility of miracles. He declares that they would be a breach in universal laws of nature and in "the necessary chain of orderly connection." Further, he asserts that Darwin's *Origin of Species* (which he maintains substantiates on undeniable grounds the origin of new species by natural causes) "must soon bring about an entire revolution of opinion in favour of the grand principle of the self-evolving powers of nature".

Frederick Temple's essay entitled, "Education of the World", is an apology for the theory of the progressive development of humanity under the Spirit of God and the necessity of freedom for continuing the developmental process which includes the study of Scriptures. He points out the distinctive contributions of the different cultures to the progression of mankind; the Hebrews have been responsible for religion and morality, the Greeks for art and reason, and the Romans for law. His plea comes to a head when he considers that the

1 Ibid., p. 96.
2 Ibid., p. 133.
3 Ibid., p. 139.
4 Ibid., pp. 8 ff.
5 Ibid., pp. 17 ff.
6 Ibid., pp. 15 ff.
Church can be taken as an example of progression having its childhood in the laws of the logical doctrine laid down by the Church Fathers and by the medieval papacy, and gaining maturity at the Reformation with the admission of toleration and the re-discovery of the Bible. The task of the Church at the present state of its development is, according to Temple, "the study of the Bible".

Temple declares that in order to progress, man must have freedom. Further, it is only by investigation with the help of all knowledge that the faith can possibly progress. In fact: "He is guilty of high treason against the faith who fears the result of any investigation whether philosophical, or scientific, or historical." C. W. Goodwin's essay on Mosaic Cosmology is of interest because it indicates that by 1860 members of the Anglican Communion felt free to criticize the contents of the Bible from the point of view of natural science. He points out the dis-

---

1 Ibid., p. 40.
2 Ibid., pp. 41 f.
3 Ibid., pp. 44 ff.
4 Ibid., p. 46.
5 Ibid., p. 34.
6 Ibid., p. 47.
7 The date of publication of Essays and Deixara.
crepancies between the Genesis story of the earth having been created in six days, along with the popular belief drawn from Biblical records that it is less than 6000 years old, and admitted geological facts.\(^1\) He points to certain of what he considers to be unsatisfactory attempts at harmonizing the Mosaic, the Biblical account of creation, and geological findings and maintains that to attempt a harmony of this type "is to evade the plain meaning of language, and to introduce obscurity into one of the simplest stories ever told, for the sake of making it accord with the complex systems of the universe which modern science has unfolded".\(^2\) Goodwin declares:

> It could not have been the object of Divine revelation to instruct mankind in physical science, man having faculties bestowed upon him to enable him to acquire this knowledge by himself.\(^3\)

In other words, the Bible is a book for theological, not scientific, teaching. Therefore, he states of the creation story in Genesis that if it is to be of theological value, it must be recognized as "not an authentic utterance of Divine knowledge, but a human utterance, which it pleased Providence to use in a special way for the education of mankind".\(^4\)

---

2 Ibid., pp. 242 f.
3 Ibid., p. 250.
Williams' report on "Bunsen's Biblical Researches" indicates the necessity of viewing the Scriptures as historical records and of taking into consideration the language and the environment in which they were written. The import of the essay is that the Scriptures are human, though inspired, records subject to the influence of environmental thought forms, and that the Scriptural writings often have a spiritual rather than a literal meaning.

Wilson's essay on "The National Church" is an apology for the "broad Church" conception of the Church as a part of the organization of the State. As such the Church ought to be concerned with ethical development and the spiritual progress of the nation. Also, there should be no "invidious distinction" between the clergy and the laity, and freedom of opinion should be conceded to the English churchman as it is to the English citizen.

Benjamin Jowett who contributed the last essay of the volume is of especial interest here not only because of the

1 Ibid., p. 53.
2 Ibid., pp. 54 ff.
3 Ibid., p. 195.
4 Ibid., p. 173.
5 Ibid., p. 189.
6 Ibid., p. 180.
content of his essay entitled, "On the Interpretation of Scriptures", but also because he was Master of Balliol when Gore entered the college for his university education.¹

Jowett's Biblical-Critical Thought

Jowett's contribution to Essays and Reviews² is final not only in the sense that it is placed last in the volume, but also in that, in a real sense, it sums up and includes much of what has been stated in the essays preceding it. Like Coleridge before him with whom he was personally acquainted,³ Jowett insists that the Scriptures should be viewed like other books⁴ and that the office of the interpreter is not to add another interpretation "but to recover the original one; the meaning, that is, of the words as they first struck on the ears or flashed before the eyes of those who heard and read them".⁵ He laments the fact that Biblical

---

¹ Gore's debt to Jowett can be ascertained from the fact that in later years, Gore kept a picture of his old Master on his wall. Referring to the picture, Gore writes: "When I feel I am stressing an argument too far I look at Jowett and he pulls me up." Prestige, op. cit., p. 38. Too, there is evidence of a close relationship between Gore and Jowett in the years after Gore had taken his degree. Ibid., p. 147. Cf. Ibid., p. 421.

² Jowett was Oxford's Regius Professor of Greek at the time Essays and Reviews was published.


⁵ Ibid., p. 338.
criticism more than any other subject has hung to the past;\textsuperscript{1} he maintains that in order to understand Scripture it is necessary for the interpreter to clear away both the dogmas and systems which have since their writing been encrusted upon them tending to conceal their meaning.\textsuperscript{2} Also he points out the need of removing the haloed attitude which men have towards Scripture and questions relating to it, questions which "no one likes to draw . . . out of their hiding-place into the light of day".\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, Jowett commends the attitude of natural science which has felt it useless to "build on assumptions",\textsuperscript{4} and depreciates the attitude in theology where he asserts: "The tendency has been to conceal the unsoundness of the foundation under the fairness and loftiness of the superstructure."\textsuperscript{5}

Further, Jowett maintains that the true doctrine of inspiration must conform to the well ascertained facts of history or science. He states: "The same fact cannot be true in religion when seen by the light of faith, and untrue in science when looked at through the medium of evidence or ex-

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 340.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 339.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 342.
\textsuperscript{4} Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{5} Loc. cit.
periment.¹ In that, for Jowett, nature and revelation are not severed, he feels no need for a reconciliation between revelation and science.² Hence, he accepts the statements of geology in reference to the age of creation as opposed to the Mosaic chronology.³

Jowett indicates that in his own day the practice was to accommodate Scripture for adaptation to creeds and theological ideas,⁴ a practice which causes "favourite verses to shine out like stars, while the rest of the page is thrown into the shade".⁵

Jowett maintains that Scriptures are intelligible,⁶ and that the use of words used in Scripture and creeds must be determined by the Scriptures.⁷ Again, he asserts that Scripture has but one meaning.⁸ This meaning must be restored by a process of criticism and inquiry in which the inquirers must have

¹ Ibid., p. 348.
² Loc. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 349.
⁴ Ibid., p. 353.
⁵ Ibid., p. 366.
⁶ Ibid., p. 382.
⁷ Ibid., p. 367.
⁸ Ibid., p. 368.
freedom of thought. The process includes the investigation of the meaning of the words of Scripture and the circumstances and lives of the Scriptural writers. Jowett maintains that our knowledge of the New Testament both as to language and subject is derived almost exclusively from itself. Hence:

No other science of hermeneutics is possible but an inductive one, that is to say, one based on the language and thoughts and narrations of the sacred writers.

Scripture is a world in itself from which must be excluded all influences whether theological or classical. The duty of the Bible critic is to get inside this world. Hence, the main sphere of study for the Biblical interpreter is the Bible, and the purpose of his task, for which he must know the origi-
nal languages of the Scriptures¹ and have the logical power to perceive the meaning of words in context,² is "to get rid of interpretation, and leave us alone in company with the author".³

As Jowett sees no conflict between the facts of science and revelation, so he sees no conflict between the Christian religion and knowledge in general. He laments the traditional interpretation saying: "It would be a strange and almost incredible thing . . . that in the present day the great object of Christianity should be, not to change the lives of men, but to prevent them from changing their opinions . . . The Christian religion is in a false position when all the tendencies of knowledge are opposed to it."⁴

Jowett is anxious that the Scriptures should not be thought of as being verbally infallible. Speaking of inspiration, Jowett asserts:

There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them different from that of preaching or teaching which they

¹ Ibid., p. 390.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 374, 376.
daily exercised; nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity.¹

Further, like Arnold,² Jowett maintains that if we are to understand that all Scripture with its contradictions and inconsistencies is inspired, we must adhere to a principle of progressive revelation.³ He avows that the reconciliation of scientific and historical inquiry is dependent on the acceptance of this principle,⁴ and he elucidates saying that "what is progressive is necessarily imperfect in its earlier stages, and even erring to those who come after".⁵

However, Jowett would have it understood that the progression of growth in the Scriptures is not regular,⁶ but that the revelation was given in broken and imperfect stages.⁷ He declares:

The great truth of the unity of God was there from the first; slowly as the morning broke in the heavens, like some central light, it filled and afterwards dispersed the mists of human passion in which it was itself enveloped.⁸

1 Ibid., p. 345.
2 Cf. ante p. 53.
3 Jowett, Essays and Reviews, p. 348.
4 Ibid., pp. 347 ff.
5 Ibid., p. 349.
6 Ibid., p. 385.
7 Loc. cit.
8 Loc. cit.
A change passes over the Jewish religion from fear to love, from power to wisdom, from the justice of God to the mercy of God, from the inheritance of sin to individual responsibility, from God in the fire and the earthquake and the storm to His voice being in the conscience.  

Thus we see that though on the one hand Jowett desires to guard against dogmatic or metaphysical interpretations or adaptations of the Scripture which pay little heed to their real meaning, on the other he wishes to withhold ground from any theory of verbal inspiration. In fact, he tends to depreciate the value of the words involved. After pointing out the importance of recovering the meaning of the original words in their context, that words have precise meanings, that Scripture can only mean one thing, and that the intention of Scripture is obvious rather than hidden, he indicates that it is a spiritual rather than a verbal meaning that must be ascertained. Jowett deplores the rigid enforcement of words of Scripture. He states: "Scripture has an inner life or soul;
it has also an outward body or form. The form is the language which imperfectly expresses the truth of religion, and, therefore, there is a danger in the practice of making words mean too much. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish the words of Scripture from the truths of Scripture, the means from the end, and recognize that Scripture is a kind of poetry, which must be interpreted from itself. Jowett insists that the power of the Gospel over language, which shows itself first of all in the original and consequently variable significance of words must be recognized.

Thus while on the one hand Jowett is anxious to get back to the Scripture's original words and their meanings, he maintains on the other that the words themselves are only a means to an end and that they are not to be identified with the truth they express. Hence, for Jowett, the Scriptures have a spiritual meaning which can be quite disconnected from the words used. He states: "Christian truth is not dependent on

1 Ibid., p. 389.
3 Jowett, Essays and Reviews, p. 409.
4 Ibid., p. 429.
5 Ibid., p. 382.
6 Ibid., p. 397.
7 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., II, 409.
the fixedness of modes of thought";¹ and, "Though we had no words for mind, matter, soul, body, and the like, Christianity would remain the same".² These words and others like them Jowett names "the figures of speech of Scripture",³ and he asserts: "The applications of Scripture should be harmonized and, as it were, interpenetrated with the spirit of the Gospel."⁴ The words of Scripture "are not the real foundation of our faith in another world, nor can they . . . add to our knowledge of it".⁵ Therefore: "They should be subjected to an overruling principle, which is the heart and conscience of the Christian teacher".⁶

Scripture can, therefore, be applied to the world generally because in the midst of different modes of thought and speech which have existed in different ages, there remains, for Jowett, a common element in human nature—"the simple feeling of truth and right".⁷ Further, in that man is endowed with this capacity for the reception of the truth, he is able

---

¹ Jowett, Essays and Reviews, p. 402.
² Loc. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 402 f.
⁴ Ibid., p. 410.
⁵ Loc. cit.
⁶ Loc. cit.
⁷ Ibid., p. 411.
to see that Scripture "has a sort of kindred, as Plato would say, with religious truths everywhere in the world". Thus, for Jowett, the historical aspects of Scripture are of minor importance. Hence, the interpretation of Scripture has nothing to do with any opinion respecting its origin for it would be quite wrong to maintain a view of religion that can be affected by the probability of the facts of Scripture being proved untrue. Therefore, Jowett can say: "The universal truth easily breaks through the accidents of time and place in which it is involved."

Jowett's Idealism

As Jowett's Biblical-critical thought is of interest and import for the understanding of Gore, so are his philosophical concepts, which stand behind his Biblical-critical ideas, of significance; these portray an idealism of which Gore was to partake.

Jowett went up to Oxford in 1836, three years after the

1 Ibid., p. 412.
2 Ibid., p. 427.
3 Ibid., p. 350.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., p. 412.
opening of the Oxford Movement. There he was personally acquainted with the leaders of the Oxford Movement and was for a time sympathetic to their cause. In 1838 he wrote: "I do not either agree or understand many of Newman's principles, but cannot help thinking that they will have on the whole a salutary influence on the Protestant Church ..." However, Jowett could not long abide the strong doctrinal stand taken by the Tractarians, and in January 1845, he writes to Stanley accusing the Oxford Movement of having fallen into a "maze of casuistry" and of never having given up Tract 90.

Being a contemporary of the leaders of the Oxford Movement and being situated in Oxford, Jowett naturally was subjected to

1 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 43.
3 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 79.
4 Letter dated August 26, 1838, to W. A. Greenhill, cited by Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 69. In a later estimate of the period, Jowett points out that the energy and ability of the generation which were responsible for the Oxford Movement was out of proportion to their attainments. He rather depreciates the learning of the leaders of the movement by pointing out that Fusey was the only one at the time who was acquainted with German. He asserts that Fusey used the language for the purpose of refuting the old German rationalism. In sum, he declares: "To say the truth, the learning of the day was of rather an attenuative sort." W. Ward, op. cit., Appendix D contributed by Jowett, p. 432.
the same spirit which Newman had described as being afloat. ¹
He too was an admirer of Coleridge² and Wordsworth.³ The fact
that Jowett was not propelled into the Oxford Movement by the
then current Romantic temper by no means indicates that he
missed the influence of the prevailing mood altogether. It
does signify, however, that Jowett was more consistent than
most of the Tractarians;⁴ instead of taking refuge in doc-
trine, he remained an Idealist.⁵ He went, in fact, for his
inspiration not only to those who introduced the idealistic
philosophy into his own day but to the fount of Idealism, to
Plato. Though Jowett states in reference to his student days
that the philosophy at the time at Oxford consisted of study
of Aristotle and Butler, he was soon to introduce into the
curriculum the study of Plato, who formed the background for
the philosophy of Aristotle and for his own.⁶ Jowett began

⁴ Newman may be excepted. Cf. Note on Newman’s Romanticism,
Chap. I, ante pp. 29 ff.
⁵ For the relation between Romanticism and Idealism cf.
Chap. I, ante p. 8, note 3. Jowett was so sceptical of fixed
document of any kind that he felt that even Dr. Arnold’s the-
ory of the Church was too concrete, that he made “external”
what ought to remain “ideal”. Letter to Stanley cited by Ab-
bott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 154. Cf. Ibid., p. 150; Chap. I,
ante p. 14, note 3, For comment on Arnold’s theory of Church
reform.
his lectures on Plato while still a tutor;\(^1\) the translation of Plato was his greatest literary effort.\(^2\) He calls the Republic, "the greatest uninspired writing,"\(^3\) and maintains that the "gems of all ideas are found in Plato."\(^4\) Jowett spent his happiest hours with Plato.\(^5\)

He is the inspired prophet or teacher who can never die, the only one in whom the outward form adequately represents the fair soul within; in whom the thoughts of all who went before him are reflected, and of all who come after him are partly anticipated . . . and [he] knows that there are many more things in philosophy than can be expressed in words, and that truth is greater than consistency.\(^6\)

Jowett was an Idealist because he was a Platonist. Hence, it is from the idealistic standpoint that both his philosophy and theology are to be understood.

Jowett is in no sense without influence from foreign schools of thought. He knew both French and German, made numerous trips to the continent,\(^7\) studied Kant, was a per-

---

1 \textit{Ibid.}, p. 99.
2 \textit{Ibid.}, I, 335, 392, 394; II, 301, 343, 361, 405.
4 \textit{Ibid.}, p. 261.
5 \textit{Ibid.}, II, 405 ff.
7 \textit{Ibid.}, I, 86, 90, 97.
sonal acquaintance of Schelling, an ardent student of Hegel, and admired Comte. Also Jowett was deeply conscious of the Tübingen School of Biblical criticism and had a deep respect for Bauer, though he does not consider himself a follower of any school. Again, though he praised the level of knowledge in Germany, he maintains that the German theologies are "but faint echoes of Schelling and Hegel," and, though impressed by the German philosophies, he avows: "The philosophical movement in Greece was far more important."

Although Jowett does not systematize his thoughts, nor is necessarily consistent with himself, he, nevertheless, gives ample evidence to the foundations of his philosophy. Like Coleridge to whom he owes much and Plato to whom he

1 Ibid., p. 146.
2 Ibid., pp. 129 f.
3 Ibid., p. 130. Jowett translated Hegel's Logic (Ibid., p. 142) but is critical of him because he felt his thought was too bound up with metaphysics. Ibid., p. 130.
4 Ibid., pp. 142, 162.
5 Ibid., p. 141.
6 Ibid., p. 260.
7 Ibid., p. 142.
8 Ibid., p. 130.
9 Ibid., II, p. 409.
10 Cf. ante p. 88.
owes more, Jowett depends on reason to disclose reality to him, though he does not explain it or give it metaphysical structure. He states:

Was ist wirklich, das ist vernünftig:
was ist vernünftig, das ist wirklich.  

[What is real, that is reasonable:
what is reasonable, that is real.]

In spite of the fact that Jowett criticizes the Idealism of both Socrates (Plato) and Spinoza because it could not be fitted to experience or nature, Jowett himself remains an Idealist believing that there is a higher sphere of reality beyond that which is evident. His reason sees both an ideal and an actual world. Hence, he maintains that ideas are essential and facts are a manifestation of ideas. He asserts for instance that the ideal or true form of the Church can never be realized in society and, therefore, it is wrong to describe the external Church.

Not only is the ideal reality beyond realization but, for Jowett, it is beyond expression. He distrusts both the words

1 Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 48.
2 From a letter to Stanley cited by Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 154.
4 Letter to Stanley cited ibid., I, 120.
and facts of Scripture and appeals to the ideas behind the words and facts.\(^1\) He has little faith in logic which must of necessity use symbols,\(^2\) and is an enemy of all metaphysics or doctrine which seeks to fix and relate truths.\(^3\) Hence, Jowett states: "In theology, the less we define the better."\(^4\)

Jowett did not, however, leave the reason to contemplate only the orb of the ideal in the search for truths of religion. For man also has a "moral nature" which is one with his mind.\(^5\) He has within him "a principle of right and truth".\(^6\) The moral law which is said to be set in the very bosom of God\(^7\) is also in the heart of man.\(^8\) It is witnessed to by Christ and the prophets, as well as the ancient legislators and philo-

---

1 Cf. ante pp. 83 ff.


6 Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 149.

7 Ibid., p. 144.

8 Ibid., p. 142.
sophers;¹ it exists everywhere and to the same degree and is the highest indication of God,² it contains the image of God,³ and it is responsible for the good within man.⁴ Further, he who follows the commands of the moral law both "retains his sense of right and wrong unimpaired",⁵ and bears the "Divine Image".⁶ To follow God's will completely is to have the perfect image of God formed within and to be one with God.⁷

Hence, rather than depending upon thoughts transferred by the terms of theology to present theological truth, which terms have a relative and transient character,⁸ Jowett would gain theological truth by contemplating "the soul".⁹ God is known through reason and conscience;¹⁰ these present the "im-

¹ Ibid., p. 144.
² Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., II, 314.
³ Ibid., p. 63.
⁴ Ibid., p. 63.
⁵ Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, pp. 144 f.
⁶ Ibid., p. 258.
⁷ Ibid., p. 258.
⁸ Ibid., p. 149.
⁹ Ibid., p. 150.
¹¹ Loc. cit.
¹² Loc. cit.
¹³ Ibid., p. 204. Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 258.
age of the divine nature. Jowett states: "People must begin again and gather first from conscience, secondly from experience, of the nature of God, and of His manner of working in the world." For Jowett, moral man is the image of God, hence it is correct to assume about God what can be inferred from "any just or good man." Further man's ideas about God are valid because they are reflections of God's mind which is one with His moral nature. Thus intellectual truth is but the narrow form of moral good. By the same token, in that all religions and all cultures have had ideas of God and appeals to morality, Jowett concludes that all religions and cultures have been valid though limited revelations of God. Not only are all men capable of conceptions of God, (conceptions which are "to be formed according to the image within us") but Jowett maintains that God is the inspiration of all good men. God is the inspiration of Plato as He is

1 Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 48.
3 Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 110.
4 Jowett, Essays and Reviews, p. 423.
5 Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, pp. 95-103.
6 Ibid., p. 44.
Likewise, Jowett sees God in the order of nature. The physical laws are seen as God's laws and reflect Him. The order in the universe reflects His image. Hence, God is revealing Himself everywhere; all truth is revelation of God and is identified with Him—"the truths of science as well as the truths of religion and morals". New branches of knowledge are regarded as "new revelation which is added to the old", for "science and revelation touch one another".

Because Jowett sees God acting and revealing Himself everywhere, God is neither natural or supernatural. He is not other than he is seen to be in the world. He is revealed

---

1 Abbott and Campbell, *op. cit.*, II, 67.
2 God is not, however, identified with nature for Jowett but is above it. Jowett, *Theological Essays*, "On Natural Religion", p. 170.
in history and science,\(^1\) in Greek and Oriental religions,\(^2\) as well as Christianity.\(^3\)

Therefore, Jowett is left with a romantic assumption of unity.\(^4\) For him all real distinctions between good and evil are false; there are only "degrees of perfection", or "degrees of imperfection".\(^5\) There is no longer any differentiation between natural and revealed religion, the one passes into the other,\(^6\) or between the Christian and the non-Christian, for all members of Christian cultures are Christians from birth.\(^7\) Conversion is not a change but "a quickening power".\(^8\) The differentiation is gone between the baptized and the unbaptized,\(^9\) and between the Sacrament of Communion and the rest of the believer's life.\(^10\) There are no hard and fast lines

---

\(^1\) Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 173. Cf. Ibid., p. 20.


\(^3\) Jowett, Theological Essays, "On Natural Religion", p. 134.

\(^4\) Cf. ante p. 92, note 4.

\(^5\) Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 45.

\(^6\) Jowett, Theological Essays, "Natural Religion", p. 155.

\(^7\) Ibid., "Change of Character", p. 40.

\(^8\) Loc. cit.

\(^9\) Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 309.

\(^10\) Loc. cit.
between: "the Church and the world", "Sundays and working days", "revelation and science", "the past and present", "the life and state of which religion speaks and the life which is ordinarily lead", for:

We are all members of the same Christian world;
We are all members of the same Christian Church.

Within the one sphere of reality Jowett retains, however, a criterion of religious judgment—that of morality. Jowett's biographers write:

In Jowett's view moral philosophy was closely bound up with religion: 'the essence of religion,' he called it; 'the great support and test of religion; for though there are differences of opinion about religion, morality is or may become, speaking generally, the same for all.'

For Jowett, the moral is the true. He states: "It is suicidal in theology to refuse to appeal to a moral criterion." Hence, the atonement must be interpreted in accordance with man's moral standards, and though he rejects the necessity of a doc-

---

1 Jowett, Theological Essays, "Natural Religion", p. 178.
2 Ibid., p. 179.
3 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., II, 188. Cf. Jowett, Theological Essays, "Natural Religion", pp. 134-35. It was a great characteristic of Jowett to prefer to "speak generally". Fairbairn states: "The spirit of Flato which shed light on all things without finally adjudicating any was the very spirit Jowett loved." A. M. Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 465.
trine of atonement, he points out that Abelard's example theory does "least violence to our moral feelings".\(^1\) The Scriptures are to be interpreted so that doctrines which would seem to be at variance with morality are excluded.\(^2\) Also, Jowett defines "Faith" as being the belief in the existence of a kingdom of God which is "absolutely in accordance with our moral notions".\(^3\) Hence, it is in morality that Jowett finds his stability. He maintains that "the greatest lesson which the religious history of mankind teaches us is that, laying aside the ceremonial and external, we should cling to the moral and spiritual",\(^4\) for our moral ideas "will not shift or alter with metaphysical schools of the age".\(^5\)

Jowett's moralistic interpretation of Christianity is further exemplified by a sermon in which he describes "the true nature of Christianity" wherein he states:

\[\text{Were Christ to appear again on earth . . . the new Gospel would be the old. It would not be revelation to clear up points of doctrine, and prove the truth of miracles, and explain the nature of a future life; it would only be the Sermon on the}\]

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 251.
\(^2\) Jowett, Essays and Reviews, pp. 429 f.
\(^4\) Jowett, Sermons on Faith and Doctrine, p. 33.
Mount, and the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and the simple teaching.¹

Representative thoughts from Jowett's own ideal religion which he entitled, "The New Christianity,"² are:

The idea of God as goodness and wisdom tending ever to realize itself in the world.

The idea of the unity of man ever realizing itself more and more.

The sense that we know as much as Christ did, or might know, if we had given ourselves for men:

... [Religion] is the upward, uncontrollable passion of human nature.

Neither St. Paul, nor Christ, really saw into a seventh heaven, or had any knowledge of a truth which can be described under the conditions of space and time different from our own.

The nature of all religion is to be a growth from a small seed in the human heart, and in the world. Every one has this seed of immortality in himself, and can give it as much development as he pleases.

The best of humanity is the most perfect reflection of God: humanity as it might be, not as it is; and the way up to Him is to be found in the lives of the best and greatest men ... .

In Christianity we live, but Christianity is fast becoming one religion among many.

God is not other than He is seen to be in this world, if we rightly understand the indications which He

¹ As cited by Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., II, 28.
² Consisting of notes on religious subjects collected by his biographers. Ibid., II, 311 f.
gives of Himself.

Anybody who gives himself up for the good of others, who takes up his cross, will find heaven on earth, and will trust God for all the rest.

... the historical character of these [the Gospels] and other ancient writings sinks into insignificance in comparison with their moral value.¹

Hence, for Jowett, the historical facts of Christianity had either disappeared or were purely of secondary or accidental import. Though in attempting to recover the original meaning of the Scriptures, he was instrumental in securing a place for Biblical criticism in British theology, Jowett's preconceptions force him to "spiritualize" what he finds; hence, he loses the force of the historical truth of revelation. He ends where he begins, in idealistic philosophy.

T. H. Green

Though the Master of Balliol, at the time Gore went up to Oxford, in the person of Jowett was an Idealist without a system of metaphysics, this lack was amply supplied in the teaching of T. H. Green.² Green's influence on the Lux Mundi group

¹ Ibid., II, 311-314.

² Jowett had a great affection for Green though he felt Green was too fond of metaphysics. Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., II, 192 f. It would seem, however, that Jowett himself was responsible for Green's love of metaphysics since, according to Metz, it was Jowett who turned Green's thinking toward Kant and Hegel. Rudolf Metz, A Hundred Years of British Philosophy (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1938), p. 269. Metz
was very substantial. Clement C. J. Webb asserts that it was
with Lux Mundi "that the influence of Green on Anglican theo-
logy was first manifest".\(^1\) Prestige points out that at Bal-
liol Gore was influenced "particularly by the philosophy of
T. H. Green".\(^2\) Gore himself suggests: "T. H. Green may con-
vince you more than "sometimes" that theology has a rational
basis—that in some rational sense, reason postulates and points
to God."\(^3\) Also, it seems to be generally conceded that Mark
Pattison's much quoted remark that the Tories were eagerly
carrying off Green's honey from his hive, had reference to the
Lux Mundi group.\(^4\) Though Gore rarely quotes directly from
also states: "It was with Green, and not before him, that Ger-
man Idealism really began its mission on Anglo-Saxon soil.
Ibid., p. 268. Metz's judgment may depend on the inference of
his terms, "German Idealism", and "mission". At any rate, as
has been indicated, Coleridge, Arnold, and Jowett were familiar
with German thought. Cf. Storr, op. cit., p. 403, note 1. How-
ever, it is of interest to note that metaphysician though he
was, Green, like Jowett, tended to depreciate the value of
Hill Green (London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1885-1888) III,
161 ff.

1 Clement C. J. Webb, A Century of Anglican Theology
2 Prestige, op. cit., pp. 15, 97. Albert Mansbridge, 
Edward Stuart Talbot and Charles Gore (London: J. M. Dent: and
Sons Limited, 1935), pp. 36, 73.
3 Prestige, op. cit., pp. 75 f.
4 From Pattison's Memoirs cited by Storr, op. cit.,
p. 403, note 1. Cf. Prestige, op. cit., p. 76; Mansbridge,
op. cit., p. 73.
Green, his philosophical, particularly his epistemological and personal idealistic conceptions, resemble Green's to an astounding degree. 2

Green's epistemological concepts which form the basis for his personal Idealism are set out in his Prolegomena to Ethics. Rejecting both the sensational atomism of Locke and the material atomism of popular science, 3 Green maintains that there is a possibility of knowledge because there exist relations between the objects of experience. 4 Further, for Green, the source of the relations that exist between the objects of experience is not of the same nature as the objects themselves. He states: "There is a principle which is not natural and which cannot without a hipotev hipotev be explained as we explain the facts of nature." 5 This principle, which Green calls "consciousness" 6 in the first instance, provides the relations between phenomena by which phenomena are known and combines


4 Ibid., p. 40.

5 Ibid., p. 16.

6 Ibid., p. 17.
relations of phenomena into one system with other recognized relations.¹

So far Green is in agreement with Kant's "synthetic unity of apperception".² Both agree that only through a principle of understanding (consciousness) is there for us any objective world.³ Speaking of the understanding or consciousness, Green states:

"It will be through it that there is for us an objective world; through it that we conceive an order of nature, with the unity of which we must reconcile our interpretations of phenomena, if they are to be other than 'subjective' illusions."⁴

The understanding is "the principle of objectivity".⁵ For Green, the understanding "makes nature for us' in the sense of enabling us to conceive that there is such a thing".⁶

However, Green is not quite satisfied with the Kantian dualism of the conception of a thing as opposed to a thing in itself; he states:

"The question, how it is that the order of nature answers to our conception of it—or, as it is sometimes put, the question, whether nature really has, or, having, will continue to have, the uniformity which belongs to it in our conception—is answered by recogni-

¹ Ibid., p. 20.
³ Ibid., p. 18.
⁴ Ibid., p. 20.
⁵ Ibid., p. 22.
tion of the fact that our conception of an order of nature, and the relations which form that order, have a common spiritual source.¹

Thus, for Green, epistemology is the basis for his metaphysics since relations by which the world is known form the order of nature and are present quite apart from our knowledge. They are necessary to phenomena but not of the same nature; their presence provides the qualities of phenomena; hence, they are the basis of reality. Further, we are enabled to conceive phenomena as are because the consciousness which apprehends, and the relations which are apprehended are a unity having a common source. This source Green names alternatively "the spiritual source", ² "one subject or spirit", ³ "a unifying principle", ⁴ "the concrete whole", ⁵ the only real substance, ⁶ a "self-realizing subject", ⁷ "a personal, i.e. a self-objectifying, consciousness", ⁸ "a self-distinguishing consciousness", ⁹ "rea-

¹ Ibid., p. 40.
² Loc. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 138.
⁴ Ibid., p. 39.
⁵ Ibid., p. 45.
⁶ Ibid., p. 117.
⁷ Loc. cit. Cf. Ibid., p. 222.
⁸ Ibid., pp. 215, 223.
⁹ Ibid., p. 64.
son,"1 "an eternal intelligence,"2 a "divine principle"3 or "God".4 It is eternal and is above nature as well as being the source of it.5

The method of the eternal principle is that of the reproduction of itself in man. In reference to its activity in the realm of knowledge, Green states:

The true account of it is held to be that the concrete whole, which may be described indifferently as an eternal intelligence realised in the related facts of the world, or as a system of related facts rendered possible by such an intelligence, partially and gradually reproduces itself in us, communicating piece-meal, but in inseparable correlation, understanding and the facts understood, experience and the experienced world.6

Thus, Green subscribes to a sort of pre-existent harmony between the facts of the world and the eternal intelligence. In the act of knowing, man is made aware of phenomena because the eternal intelligence reproducing itself in man establishes the same correlation between the mind of man and phenomena as pre-exists between the eternal intelligence and phenomena. Green illustrates further saying:

1 Ibid., pp. 241, 257.
2 Ibid., p. 43.
3 Ibid., pp. 207, 214, 215.
4 Ibid., pp. 216, 223, 228, 394.
5 Ibid., p. 134.
6 Ibid., p. 43.
... it would seem that the attainment of the knowledge is only explicable as reproduction of itself, in the human soul, by the consciousness for which the cosmos of related facts exists—a reproduction of itself, in which it uses the sentient life of the soul as its organ.

As the eternal principle is responsible for the growth of knowledge, so is it necessary for the growth of character. It is the principle which separates man from the animals which makes man "a self" and allows him to stand outside the natural chain of cause and effect, permitting him "self-originated" activity. The free "self-conscious self" is, for Green, the personality which he defines as "the quality in a subject of being consciously an object to itself". This characteristic "necessarily belongs to God and to any being in whom God in any measure reproduces or realises himself". God is the complete personality, the eternal subject which "is all that the self-conscious subject, as developed

2 Ibid., p. 116.
3 Ibid., p. 94.
4 Ibid., p. 97. This is not to deny the then prevalent evolutionary theory. Green states: "... there may have been a progressive development, through hereditary transmission, of the animal system which has become organic to the distinctive intelligence of man ..." Ibid., p. 100.
5 Ibid., pp. 216 f.
6 Ibid., p. 216.
in time, has the possibility of becoming; in which the idea of the human spirit . . . is completely realised". ¹ This suggests our relationship to God.

He is not merely a Being who has made us, in the sense that we exist as an object of the divine consciousness in the same way in which we must suppose the system of nature so to exist, but that He is a Being in whom we exist; with whom we are in principle one; with whom the human spirit is identical.²

Further, in that man possesses a self-conscious personality which cannot be supposed to pass away, "it partakes of the divine nature of the eternal",³ he is supposed to partake of immortality.

However, for Green, the self-realization of the eternal spirit in time, that is in the personality of man, is necessarily limited because of man's finite animal nature.

... so long as it is the life of man, i.e., of beings who are born and grow and die; in whom an animal nature is the vehicle through which the divine self-realising spirit works; in whom virtue is not born ready-made but has to be formed ... through habit and education in conflict with opposing tendencies; so long the contrast must remain for the human soul between itself and the infinite spirit . . . ⁴

Hence, for man, perfect, complete personality is an impossibility while he possesses a finite nature. Thus, the self-

¹ Ibid., pp. 222 f.
² Loc. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 224.
⁴ Ibid., p. 372.
realization of personality in the world is a process in which the subject is "something, in itself or potentially, which it has not yet in time actually become". 1

This development or the self-realization of the divine spirit in man which is the self-realization of the man himself has concrete result in the development of man's capacities. The development of man's capacities is, in turn, for Green, the standard of virtue.

The spiritual progress of mankind is thus an unmeaning phrase, unless it means a progress of personal character and to personal character—a progress of which feeling, thinking, and willing subjects are the agents and sustainers, and of which each step is a fuller realisation of the capacities of such subjects. 2

This development is ever upward. "It is simply unintelligible unless understood to be in the direction of more perfect forms of personal life." 3 The good, therefore, is related to personality. "Our ultimate standard of worth is an ideal of personal worth. All other values are relative to value for, of, or in a person." 4

However, though man is definitely an individual, and though

1 Ibid., p. 222.
2 Ibid., p. 220. Hence, Green's Idealism is known as "personal idealism".
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 218.
all worth must be judged on the basis of personal worth, the self-realization of man is carried out in the presence of other men. Green indicates the importance of society in saying: "Social life is to personality what language is to thought."\(^1\)

Further:

It is only in the intercourse of men, each recognized by each as an end, not merely a means, and thus as having reciprocal claims, that the capacity is actualized and that we really live as persons.\(^2\)

Thus society is, as a matter of fact, as necessary for the individual personality as the personality is for the society,\(^3\) for "only through society . . . is personality actualized".\(^4\)

Here we can see the basis for Green's ethics. Virtue is the development, the self-realization, of the personality, and development of the individual depends on contact with and self-realization of all members of society.\(^5\) The ideal of society is "a society in which every one shall treat every one else as his neighbour, in which to every rational agent the well-being or perfection of every other such agent shall be included in that perfection of himself for which he lives".\(^6\)

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 217.
\(^2\) Loc. cit.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 225.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 226.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 471.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 244.
Moreover, we have knowledge of our proper end "only according to the measure of what we have so far done or are doing for its attainment".\(^1\) The more complete the realization of its capacities, the more clearly will the personality apprehend its own infinity, which is ever beyond it.\(^2\) Thus, according to Green, we have no knowledge of the full realization of the personality, of "what the ultimate perfection of the human spirit would be; what its life would be when all its capabilities were fully realized".\(^3\) Further: "We can no more do this than we can form a positive conception of what the nature of God in itself is"\(^4\), for: "All the notions that we can form of human excellences or virtues are in some way relative to present imperfections."\(^5\) However, Green maintains that though we do not have knowledge of our end, "we must, no doubt, have a definite notion of the direction in which the 'Summum Bonum' is to be sought".\(^6\)

In that virtue is the development of the capacities of personality, the good, according to Green, is the will to re-

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 232.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 372.
\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 445 f.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 446.
\(^5\) Loc. cit.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 448.
alize one's self including the self-realization of all persons.¹ For Green, this ideal "becomes, in Kant's language, an imperative, and a categorical imperative"² "It will command something to be done universally and unconditionally, irrespectively of whether there is in any one, at any time, [with] an inclination to do it."³ Hence, the imperative must be obeyed for its own sake.⁴

As opposed to virtue, Green maintains that vice is the exertion of the self in a direction that does not lead to the full development of its capacity.⁵ It is the exercise of the same capacity of reason as is exercised in virtue, but it takes "its object and content from desires of which the satisfaction is inconsistent with the real bettering of man".⁶

In realizing himself man's attitude to the infinite spirit of whom he must think of "as better than the best that he himself can attain to",⁷ is ascribed as "self-abasement before

¹ Ibid., pp. 232 f.
² Ibid., p. 233.
³ Loc. cit.
⁵ Ibid., p. 210. It would seem that here there is a grave internal weakness in Green's thought. If the development of the self is due to the realization of the divine spirit within man, as Green avows, then it would seem quite impossible for the self to exert itself against its own self-realization. Hence the possibility of evil or vice would be ruled out.
⁶ Ibid., p. 211.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 372.
an ideal of holiness". But the act of self-abasement, in
that it is a relationship between man and the infinite spirit
to whom man is related and of whom he partakes, may also be
described as "self-exaltation", the act in which the heart
is lifted up to God, in which the whole inner man goes forth
after an ideal of holiness".

Note A

A Proposed Commentary of the New Testament

Westcott's love for the Scriptures as well as his deep
desire to make them known and lucid prompted him into an ex¬
treme amount of work. One of the most ambitious of his pro¬
jects was an undertaking with Lightfoot and Hort, a com¬
mentary for the whole New Testament. According to this scheme,
Lightfoot was to comment on the Pauline writings, Westcott on
the Johannine, and Hort on the historical-judaic. Hort was
only able to publish a very small portion of the plan, but
Lightfoot and Westcott made considerable progress with their
tasks.

1 Loc. cit.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., pp. 372 f.
I, 417 ff., wherein a diagram showing the divisions of the pro¬
posed project is contained.
Note B
Jowett and the Oxford Movement

The Liberalism which, according to R. W. Church, had its birth at Oxford on the occasion of the defeat of the first stage of the Oxford Movement1 found one of its greatest protagonists in Jowett. During his student days Jowett was acquainted with Thomas Arnold and was certainly influenced by his Liberalism2 as well as his thoughts on Biblical criticism.3 He was also an admirer of both Coleridge and Wordsworth,4 and in later years, along with Arthur Stanley, Jowett was instrumental in carrying forward the Liberal cause at Oxford. He was active in matters of university reform5 as well as in the school of Biblical criticism out of which came the publication, Essays and Reviews. Hence, Jowett was both a child of and a part of the Liberal movement which was in conflict with the Tractarians. Therefore, it is not surprising that he expresses his antagonism toward the Oxford Movement strongly.

3 Cf. ante p. 82.
4 Cf. ante p. 88.
5 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 176; Ibid., II, 24.
He maintains that High Church principles can never be impressed on the poor;\(^1\) he detested formality and ritual in Church services\(^2\) and deplores the lack of criticism of the Gospels by "the orthodox English divines".\(^3\) He is at odds with the ideas of the "Fuseyites" in matters of education\(^4\) and is opposed to any belief in a sacerdotal ministry. He satirizes the doctrine of Apostolic Succession,\(^5\) states that "treachery to the clergy is loyalty to the Church",\(^6\) that the salvation of religion is through the laity and statesmen,\(^7\) and was certain that Newman would call him an infidel.\(^8\)

Nor was Jowett to go unchallenged by Fusey who, though the Tractarian movement had in the main come to its end, nevertheless remained active in what he believed to be the orthodox cause. Fusey felt that the liberals were going too far in matters of university reform.\(^9\) In reference to their Biblical

---

\(^1\) Ibid., I, 147.
\(^2\) Ibid., II, 31.
\(^3\) Ibid., I, 149.
\(^4\) Ibid., I, 150. Cf. Ibid., p. 280 f.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 221.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 150.
\(^7\) Loc. cit.
\(^8\) Ibid., II, 78. Instead of being repelled by the French Revolution as was Newman, (Cf. Chap. I, ante p. 13) Jowett respected it. Ibid., I, 134.

critical work, he called them "the Germanizing School", and, according to the authors of Jowett's biography, Fusey was twice one of those responsible for questioning Jowett's orthodoxy. Thus, Jowett was asked to subscribe anew to the Articles before being allowed to accept the appointment to the Regius Professorship of Greek, and upon the publication of Essays and Reviews, Fusey was among the party who failed in their attempt to bring Jowett before the Chancellor's Court to try him for heresy.

---

2 Abbott and Campbell, op. cit., I, 238.
3 Ibid., pp. 310 ff.
CHAPTER III

THE BEGINNINGS OF LIBERAL CATHOLICISM

With the publication of Lux Mundi, the two movements, Tractarianism and Liberalism, which had clashed at Oxford only a little more than a half century before, had gone the full circle and joined hands. Out of the Oxford Movement had come the re-catholicization of at least a portion of the Church of England; out of the Liberal school Biblical criticism was born.

It is important to notice, however, that the two movements had more in common that just the locus of their origin. Both were profoundly affected by the philosophy of Idealism (the Tractarians by Idealism in its Romantic judgment of the past); both were critical movements in that both were dissatisfied with the then present day interpretation of the subject matter with which they were dealing (the Tractarians with the Church, the Biblical critics with the Scriptures); both were attempts to discover the essence of validity; and, oddly enough, both accepted the canon of human understanding as the criterion of truth. This last characteristic led in both movements to reliance on private judgment as the arbiter of all questions. This is quite obvious in the case of the Lib-
erals as well as Newman, the leader of the Oxford Movement,\(^1\) but it is equally true, though perhaps more subtle with the rest of the Tractarians. Froude had argued from a moral ethos,\(^2\) Keble from probability,\(^3\) and even Pusey, who more than any other knew the value of historical research,\(^4\) used his scholarship to substantiate doctrine proposed by predilection.\(^5\)

Certainly the Tractarians felt that by asserting the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which they supposed was of divine origin, they were avoiding the problems of individualism. The Liberals, along with Newman, also attempted to avoid the problem by positing a "truth apprehending faculty which they felt provided a direct contact with God. This was "reason" for Coleridge\(^6\) and Jowett\(^7\) and "conscience" for Newman.\(^8\) However, the problem of individualistic interpretation remained

---


7 Cf. ante pp. 91 ff. This is also true of Green. Cf. ante pp. 103 ff.

in both movements because neither had recourse to the one means given man—that of the historically existent Church meditating on the message of Scripture—by which he is able to avoid the problem. It was quite impossible for Coleridge, Jowett, or Newman to take the position of the Church seriously in the apprehension of truth since they were convinced that each individual was endowed, naturally equipped, with the necessary faculties. The position of the Oxford Movement in general made it extremely difficult for the Tractarians to appreciate the position of the Scriptures as the fount of truth because of their high regard for tradition. It was by tradition that the Tractarians validated their doctrine of Apostolic Succession, on which they based the doctrine of the Church. The Church thus defined, then, becomes the judge of tradition as well as Scripture. This results not only in a circular, i.e., invalid, argument, but raises tradition to a position which is at least as high if not higher than that of Scripture.¹

Though the two movements differed in their immediate tasks, the Tractarians emphasized doctrine to substantiate the Church, while the Biblical critics minimized its import-

ance in order to see the Scriptures in what they considered to be an unbiased light; the movements were alike in that both were given impetus by and used the spirit of investigation which was a direct result of the rationalism of the philosophies of Descartes, Locke, and Hume.¹

Biblical criticism, which had its beginnings in Hobbes and Spinoza, used the methods of inquiry in order to investigate the contradictions in Scripture as well as to find the central doctrines on which faith could be based.² Tractarianism found its sphere of investigation to be first of all the Medieval Church to which it was romantically attracted and later to the Fathers in order to find support for their desired doctrines of the Church.³

Thus, the two streams, Catholicism and Liberalism, which


² Ibid., p. 46. Later the need for Scriptural investigations was emphasized by the successes of science in other areas, especially after Darwin's Origin of Species.

³ It is interesting to note that the Tractarian movement which began with the Romantic temper ends in rationalism, while the Biblical-critical movement which had its beginning in the more rationalistic mood finds itself at the time of the publication of Lux Mundi, at any rate, in its Oxford branch, represented by Stanley, who had died eight years previously, and the still living Jowett, inexorably bound up with Idealism. (Romanticism is the idealization of a period of history or of any aspect of existence which results in its having an unreal appearance.) Cf. Chp. I, ante p. 8, note 3; p. 17, note 1.
had formed for the first time in a really visible way in British theology at Oxford a little more than a half century before, came back together in the \textit{Lux Mundi} group to form Liberal Catholicism.\footnote{Cf. Introduction, ante pp. 3-5.}

\textbf{\textit{Lux Mundi} and Gore's Biblical-Critical Thought}

At the time \textit{Lux Mundi} was published, Anglican theology was ripe for the synthesis it provided. The gulf between the Tractarians on the one hand and the Liberals on the other was growing even wider.\footnote{Cf. Chp. II, Note B, ante pp. 113 ff.} The advance of Biblical criticism during the fifty years previous to the publication of the volume\footnote{Referred to by Gore in \textit{Lux Mundi}, "Preface to the Tenth Edition". Charles Gore, \textit{Lux Mundi} (Twelfth Edition; London: John Murray, 1891), p. xvi.} indicated that the dogmatic stand which the later Tractarians had taken toward the Scriptures\footnote{Of. Chp. I, ante p. 27, note 2; p. 69. Liddon, in a letter to Gore on the occasion of the publication of \textit{Lux Mundi}, points out his disappointment and disagreement with the position displayed by Gore in his essay. J. O. Johnston, \textit{Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon} (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1904), pp. 364 ff.} was no longer tenable. On the other hand the Liberals such as Jowett and the other contributors to \textit{Essays and Reviews} were fast giving up any distinctions between Christianity and idealistic philosophy.\footnote{Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 71 ff. As Prestige states, "It..."}
Therefore, the Lux Mundi group, in attempting "to put the Catholic faith in its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems", 1 seemed to provide the needed solution.

As far as Gore was concerned, putting the Catholic faith in the right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems meant the acceptance of Biblical criticism. 2 In his essay entitled "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration", wherein he sets out to a position which he was never to appreciably alter, 3 Gore, as Knox and Vidler point out, draws out the inference of the Lux Mundi group's intentions in plain language. 4

Gore's contribution to Lux Mundi can be regarded as both was plain . . . that the old outlook on the Bible could not much longer be maintained. Broad Churchmen, like Jowett, offered no refuge; the faith they had to offer did not seem worth having. 5 G. L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1935), p. 119. Lidon offered a Christianity impossible to believe, Jowett one not worth believing. Loc. cit.

1 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. vii.


3 As Prestige reports, Gore "had made up his mind extremely early about every question of importance". Prestige, op. cit., p. 66. Prestige further records that he changed his mind only once with reference to any important disputed question in theology, that being the question of divorce. He at first allowed it on the basis of the Gospel of Matthew, but later repudiated his first conclusion. Prestige, op. cit., p. 128. Cf. Charles Gore, The Question of Divorce (London: John Murray, 1911), p. v.

an apology for the use and legitimacy of Biblical criticism as well as a limited application of that which he had advocated. He believed strongly that the way for the Church to face the problem of Biblical criticism was not by foreclosing the question by appeals to dogma but rather "by facing in frank and fair discussion the problems raised".  

Further, he was convinced that the results of the critical schools by augmenting the understanding of the books and enriching their sense of inspiration had enhanced rather than decreased the value of the New Testament, and he felt that its application to the Old would likewise be profitable. He states: "It is the test of the Church's legitimate tenure that she can encourage free inquiry into her title-deeds."  

Gore's high regard for the Scriptures can be somewhat ascertained by the fact that he writes: "The Church has in Holy Scripture the highest expression of the mind of Christ." Further, he points out that familiarity with it by the Church's members will protect its tradition against deterioration. Gore expresses his high regard for the historicity of the

1 Gore, Lux Mundi, pp. 265 f.


4 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 238.

5 Loc. cit.
Scriptures by saying of them:

As a source of evidence they contain the record of historical facts with some of which at any rate the Creed of Christendom is inseparably interwoven. Thus it is impossible for Christians to know what they are about, to depreciate the importance of the historical evidence for those facts at least of which the Creed contains a summary. ¹

However, for Gore; as for Arnold, Westcott, and Jowett, ² all Scripture is not on the same level.

It is of the essence of the New Testament, as the religion of the Incarnation, to be final and catholic: on the other hand, it is of the essence of the Old Testament to be imperfect because it represents a gradual process of education by which man was lifted out of depths of sin and ignorance. ³

Accordingly, he traces what he considers to be a progress in the Hebraic religion from God abolishing idols but tolerating sacrifices to the abolishment of sacrifices, and from the allowance of circumcision to the giving up of their circumcision. He states of the Hebrews: "... they became instead of heathens, Jews, instead of Jews, Christians, being betrayed as it were by gradual changes into the acceptance of the Gospel." ⁴

¹ Ibid., p. 247. Cf. Ibid., p. 249.
⁴ Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 240.
Though Gore has a high regard for the Scriptures, his equally high, if not higher, regard for the Church, i.e. tradition, causes him to infer that in the early Church there existed a tradition which though it was "once for all delivered",¹ was not entirely confided to the written records.

... the Apostolic writings were written as occasion required, within the Church, and for the Church. They presuppose membership in it and familiarity with its tradition. They are secondary, not primary instructors; for edification, not for initiation.²

Over thirty-five years later he re-affirms this position saying: "... the books of the New Testament were the books of the Christian Church and they presuppose its tradition as already known."³ It is for this same reason that Gore feels that no hard and fast line can be drawn between the books that lie within the canon and those that lie without it.⁴ He maintains, for instance, that it is impossible to separate the Epistle to the Hebrews and St. Clement's letter, for it seems irrational to attribute absolute authority to the anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews which represents secondhand Apostolic


² Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 248.

³ Gore, The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day, p. 8. Hence, as Gore is fond of saying, "'the church to teach' ... 'the Bible to prove'". Gore, The Incarnation, p. 81.

⁴ Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 248.
teaching and interpreted as being superior to the Epistle of Clement which represents the same stream of Apostolic teaching, but being only one short stage lower down.\(^1\)

Thus, it can be seen that in a real sense Gore in *Lux Mundi* places tradition on at least an equal level with the Scriptures. This opinion is further verified by the fact that he regards Scripture as he feels the early Church regarded it, as Froude and Newman regarded it,\(^2\) not as the source of the Church's teaching, but rather as the test of its validity.

He declares that "the Church taught and the Scripture tested and verified or corrected her teaching".\(^3\)

Though Gore maintained that the Scriptures should be open to criticism and that the historical accuracy of many accounts of the Old Testament was open to question,\(^4\) he nevertheless believed that Scriptures were inspired. He maintains that in the case of the Jews inspiration involved the action of the Holy Spirit upon the subjects of inspiration.\(^5\)

---

1 *Loc. cit.*


... special men, prophets, psalmists, moralists, historians, were thus the inspired interpreters of the Divine message to and in the race: and their inspiration lies in this, that they were the subjects of a movement of the Holy Ghost, so shaping, controlling, quickening their minds and thoughts and aspirations, as to make them the instruments through which was imparted 'the knowledge of God and of the spiritual life.'

However, inspiration, for Gore as for Jowett, is not to be understood as a superseding of human faculties, but rather an intensification of them. Speaking of the prophets, Gore states: "They see deeper under the surface of life what God is doing, and therefore, further into the future what He will do." Agreeing with Westcott, Gore maintains that the inspiration of the Apostles is to be understood as "an endowment which enables men of all ages to take their teachings as representing, and not misrepresenting, His [Christ's] teaching and Himself." Further, Gore claims that, according to St. Paul, inspiration is "a positive endowment which qualifies the writings of those who were its subjects, to be permanent sources of spiritual instruction."
Inspiration, then, is "the illumination of the judgment of the recorder". Gore emphasizes, however, that inspiration does not involve "the miraculous communication of facts not otherwise to be known, a miraculous communication such as would make the recorder independent of the ordinary processes of historical tradition". "Nor would it appear that spiritual illumination, even in the highest degree, has any tendency to lift man out of the spiritual conditions of knowledge which belong to their time."

The practical result of the Scriptures' being inspired is, according to Gore, "that we submit ourselves to the teaching of every book which is given to us as inspired". He maintains that we should put ourselves to school with each of the inspired writers especially with those we are predisposed not to study.

So was the unity of Biblical-critical thought with Catholic faith. The result was, of course, that the rationalistic dogmatic interpretation of Scriptures held by Fusey and Liddon was thrown completely overboard and catholicism was wedded to Biblical criticism.

1 Ibid., p. 260.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 256.
5 Loc. cit.
Gore's Biblical-Critical Thought in General

Gore's Biblical-critical thought by no means ends with his essay in Lux Mundi either in profession or in application. Though he admits not being a scientific exegete, Biblical-critical conceptions were a deep formative influence in his theology. 2

Throughout his work 3 Gore continually maintained that:

Historical criticism must be applied impartially to all writings which claim to convey history, and therefore to the New Testament equally with the Old Testament books. 4

---

1 Charles Gore, The Doctrine of the Infallible Book (London: Student Christian Movement, 1934), p. 9. Ekström states: "It may first be established that Gore can by no means be regarded as a professional exegete. His commentaries on the Sermon on the Mount, Romans, Ephesians, and the Epistles of St. John are to be looked upon rather as practical expositions and as commentaries to his dogmatic system than as exagetical works in a scientific sense." Ragnar Ekström, The Theology of Charles Gore (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1944), p. 76.

2 Besides producing his own expositions of Scriptures: St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and The Epistles of St. John, Gore was also chosen as one of the editors of The New Commentary on Holy Scripture.

3 Gore is the author of forty books as well as numerous pamphlets. A. Mansbridge, Edward Stuart Talbot and Charles Gore (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Limited), 1935, p. 75.

Like Westcott, Gore staunchly maintains the historical validity of the New Testament records\(^1\) claiming for them, as does the preface to Luke, that they are records from first-hand evidence.\(^2\) Further, Gore declares that the Scriptures testify to the traditional Creed of the Church,\(^3\) and that in England, at any rate, the weight of criticism was on the side of the creeds.\(^4\) However, he staunchly maintains that the historical accuracy of the Scriptures "does not imply the belief in the infallibility of the records in detail".\(^5\)

All that is necessary in order to maintain the faith of St. Paul and St. John is that the Gospels and Acts should give us substantially true history and the Epistles a true record of the apostolic interpretation.

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. Chap. II, ante pp. 65 f.


of the Gospel.\(^1\)

The Gospels are "good history."\(^2\) They are the records of eye-witnesses upon which the Creeds of the Church depend.\(^3\)

Along with his upholding the principles of Biblical criticism, Gore maintains that the Scriptures are necessary in order that the Church "might be constantly in touch with the original revelation on the maintenance of which its healthy life depended."\(^4\) He asserts: "The Bible in all its parts is the record of God's revelation of Himself."\(^5\) Therefore, "the Bible is the ultimate record of the faith".\(^6\) Gore declares that he agrees with "the theory of the Fathers that Scripture is the sole source of revealed truth",\(^7\) and that it is impossible to get either behind or away from them.\(^8\) Hence, Gore holds not

---

\(^1\) Gore, Doctrine of the Infallible Book, p. 45. Cf. Gore, War and the Church, p. 139; Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 166; Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 36.

\(^2\) Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 166. Cf. Gore, War and the Church, p. 139.

\(^3\) Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 215.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 160. Cf. Ibid., p. 189.


\(^7\) Ibid., p. 69. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 244.

only that the Scriptures are the body of testimony by which doctrine must be proved,¹ but also ascribes to the formula that nothing is binding on faith "except what is contained in Scripture".²

Hence, if Gore rebelled against a rationalistic verbal inspirational view of the Scriptures which he calls "the religion of the book",³ i.e. Protestantism, which "would ignore the authority of tradition in the Church",⁴ on the one hand, on the other his great respect for the Bible enabled him to ward off both the "New Theology" which placed little real historical value in either the Scriptures or tradition, and Roman Catholicism, which allowed tradition to be valued at the expense of the Bible.

However, it must be pointed out that, in spite of Gore's high view of the Scriptures, his relation of Scriptures to tradition is not at all fixed but vacillates as need requires. He is definite in stating that the apostolic tradition is authoritative and final.⁵ Hence, "the later Church can never

¹ Charles Gore, Why We Christians Believe in Christ (Bishop Gore's Bampton Lectures Shortened for Popular Use by the Rev. T. C. Fry) (London: John Murray, 1904), p. 34.
³ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 178.
⁴ Ibid., p. 225.
⁵ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 250. Cf. Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 82; Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 240.
know what the early Church did not.

1. Generally and especially when writing against the verbal inspirationalists, Gore maintains that there is a definite tradition behind the New Testament writings which presuppose them, to which they refer, and by which in the form of the Church, they must be interpreted. 2. Then again when stressing the importance of Scriptures as the standard of doctrine as against both the "New Theology" and Roman Catholicism, he bends in the other direction, indicating not only that the scriptural reports convey valid accounts of historical events, but, more important, that though they are a part of the same growth as Apostolic Succession and the Creeds, 3. they are the sole standard of doctrine. 4. Thus, nothing can be "a part of the necessary faith but what can be verified and proved in Scripture"; 5. they are the "sole source" of revealed truth. 6. Gore even

1 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 44. Cf. Ekström, op. cit., p. 75.


4 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, pp. 63 f; Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 218; Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 224.

5 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 15.

6 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 69.
goes so far as to declare that "for us today there is no testimony worth considering which is not in the New Testament". 1 Hence, "if the Creeds stand . . . it must be because the Gospels stand". 2

Thus, though Gore is consistent in always declaring that the Scriptures are not verbally infallible, that they are constantly in need of criticism, 3 and that they present a valid historical record, the value he places on their actual conclusiveness depends upon the situation in which he finds himself. Generally speaking, and especially against those who are predisposed to interpret the Bible as being verbally infallible, he maintains that the Scriptures contain a good deal but not


3 Hence, it would seem that Sanday somewhat underestimates Gore's intention if not his practice when he maintains that Gore is willing to criticize the Old but not the New Testament. W. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914), p. 12. Bezzant at least recognizes that Gore proposes to apply criticism to all historical records of the Church, the New as well as the Old Testament. J. S. Bezzant, "Bishop Gore as a Christian Apologist", The Modern Churchman XIV, No. 10 (January, 1925), 575. Also, it should be pointed out that though Gore, like Coleridge, Jewett, and Westcott before him, was well acquainted with the Continental languages and Biblical-critical thought in general, (Gore, Lux mundi, p. xvi) as well as the destructive criticism of Strauss, Baur and Renan, (Gore, Belief in God, pp. 16 f.) and that of Harnack, Schweitzer, and Bousset, (Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 165) his profound respect for the Scriptures never allowed him to break with the historicity of the New Testament. Hence, his sympathies are with the more conservative rather than the more extreme critics. Gore, Lux mundi, p. xvi.
all of the apostolic tradition. However, when he attempts to
delineate the content of the tradition which is behind the
Scriptures, his account contains nothing not included in the
present canon.¹

It would seem that Gore adopts this mode of interpretation in order to enable him to indicate that Scripture is not
the complete apostolic tradition. This would give grounds for believing that the Church somehow encompasses the remainder of
tradition, and, therefore, it becomes not only the interpreter
of Scripture, but the source of doctrine. Thus Gore accomplishes three ends with a single blow: infallibility is done
away with; the criterion of Scripture and Scripture alone as
a basis for doctrine, against which the Tractarians polemized,
is destroyed;² and he has a foundation for doctrines which he
believes to be necessary but can not be substantially founded
on the Scriptures. This concerns especially the doctrine of
Apostolic Succession which is of utmost importance for his
doctrine of the Church, but which, nevertheless, as Gore admits, is not explicitly indicated in the New Testament.³

² Cf. Note A, ante pp. 27 f. Hence, the New Testament should be read in the light of the "ancient Catholic tradi-
³ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 144.
Therefore, Gore has the possibility of recourse to oral but valid unrecorded tradition, a message "enshrined in the memory of Churches".1

In another sense, however, when Gore attempts to reconcile the claims of the Scriptures with reason and knowledge, he comes very near to giving up the real sense of the primacy of Scripture. Though he maintains that "the Christian religion is first of all a life based on teaching accepted as the Word of God",2 he also insists that this word or teaching "must be constantly verified in an age long and nearly worldwide experience".3 Further, he states: "No doubt its message and claim must be tested."4 This testing, Gore indicates, is for most men of a practical nature, but the intellectual test

---

1 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 23. Cf. ante p. 124; Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, pp. 244 ff. In a late judgment on the relation of tradition and Scripture, Gore indicates that the Scriptures are all-sufficient. In reference to the question of unwritten tradition he states: "The question suggests itself, but does not appear to have been raised in ancient times, what proof can be offered that all that the Apostles or their immediate disciples regarded as belonging to the tradition appears in their occasional writings? Why should there not have been an unwritten tradition also and equally apostolic? To this question there is perhaps no answer. It seems to have been taken for granted that the providence which presided over the coming of the Gospel secured the 'all-sufficiency' of the Scriptures on which the Fathers frequently insist." Gore, editor, New Commentary on Holy Scripture, p. 17.

2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 274.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Loc. cit.
must be likewise employed.¹

If Christian teaching or the Word of God can be tested, it must necessarily be subordinate to that standard to which it is compared. Thus, it can in no sense be considered final. One test which Gore would apply is, as has been indicated, the practical test, but finally his standard, as we will see, is rationality or reason.² Thus, in Roman Catholic Claims, he asserts that doctrines may be objected to as being "out of harmony with Scripture and Reason".³ Again he states: "We are bound to keep our religious creed on the highest level of truth that we can attain to in our present state of existence",⁴ and he asserts that to understand the Scriptures it is necessary to approach them with the proper preconceptions relative to their content.

In order to have grounds for believing the facts, in order to be susceptible of their evidence, we require an antecedent state of conception and expectation. A whole set of presuppositions about God, about the slavery of sin, about the reasonableness of redemption must

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² Cf. Chap. IV, post p.168ff. It is, of course, possible and even necessary to test the message of Scripture in part with the whole of it. But if as a whole it is the Word of God, then it is sui generis and stands outside the possibility of being put to a proof.


be present with us. So only can the facts presented to us in the Gospel come to us as credible things, or as parts of an intelligible universe, correlated elements in a rational whole.\(^1\)

If it is true, as Gore explains, that we require "an antecedent state of conception and expectation\(^2\) to be susceptible to Scriptural evidence, it follows that this state or "set of presuppositions",\(^3\) unless it comes from Scripture itself, (and, for Gore, it does not) is actually prior to Scripture both in origin and importance. If it is true, as we have avowed, that any standard or presuppositions in the light of which something else judged must necessarily be of greater import than that upon which the judgment falls,\(^4\) then if Scripture is to be judged as credible in the light of presuppositions, the presuppositions and their source are primary and Scripture secondary.

Therefore, when considering Scripture as a part of a rational whole, Gore subordinates it to the content and source of these presuppositions which form the basis of rationality, that is, the rational faculty considered by Gore to function as an act of the whole personality, the expression of man's

---


\(^3\) *Loc. cit.*

\(^4\) Cf. ante p. 136.
"fundamental self".¹

There is no doubt of Gore's good intentions in this matter. He certainly seems to be attempting to express the truth, that it is humanly impossible to approach any historical evidence including the Scriptures without a certain set of presuppositions, and, therefore, it is necessary to have the correct ones if Scripture is to be correctly interpreted. However, it is when considering the source of these necessary prejudices, a source which determines their kind, that Gore seems to blunder. For him they are the product of reason, while, according to the New Testament, it would seem that their source must be the mind of Christ Himself. This can be known to us only through the New Testament as interpreted by the Church; hence they cannot be considered prejudices in the usual sense at all but can be known only as the Mind of Christ.

¹ Gore, Belief in God, p. 43. This is evidently that to which Åkström has reference when he states of Gore's position: "Doctrines are true, not because they are in Scripture, but Scripture is true because it contains doctrines of everlasting truth", though he does not specifically elaborate. Åkström, op. cit., p. 73.
Note A

Inspiration and Ξenosis

As has been indicated, Gore believes the Scriptural writers to be inspired, not in the sense of their having had a special supernatural capacity to receive supernatural knowledge, but in their having been recipients of the quickening power of the Holy Spirit.\(^1\) Hence, the writer's human faculties were not superseded but intensified.\(^2\) For Gore, revelation is definitely not the miraculous communication of otherwise unknown facts or any process that would lift men out of the ordinary processes of tradition or give them knowledge which would not belong to their time.\(^3\)

It is of extreme consequence for Gore's theology that the import of this theory of the action of the Holy Spirit in the act of inspiration is not confined to the writers of Scripture, but extends to the person of Christ Himself. Gore maintains: "It is contrary to His [Christ's] whole method to reveal His Godhead by any anticipations of natural knowledge."\(^4\)

\(^1\) Cf. ante pp. 125 f.
\(^2\) Cf. ante p. 126.
\(^3\) Cf. ante p. 127.
\(^4\) Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 264. Gore maintains that "the supernatural action of the Holy Ghost does not destroy the natural
Thus, "the incarnation was a self-emptying of God to reveal Himself under conditions of human nature and from the human point of view". Therefore, all that Christ revealed He revealed "through, and under conditions of, a true human nature". "Thus He used human nature, its relation to God, its conditions of experience, its growth in knowledge, its limitations of knowledge." Hence, according to Gore, Christ saw and felt only as man ought to see and feel, and He uses the terminology of the existing interpretations of science and limited His knowledge to the "ken of existing history". "He willed so to restrain the beams of His Deity as to observe the limits of science of His age, and He puts Himself in the same relation to its historical knowledge." Thus, neither the writers of Scripture nor Christ were imbued with any power that lifted them out of the limitations of human knowledge. They were given the power of the Holy Spirit, to be sure, but only such as intensified their human faculties


1 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 264.
2 Ibid., pp. 264 f.
3 Ibid., p. 265.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Loc. cit.
not such as allowed the superseding of them. Hence, Gore's theory of Biblical inspiration and his Kenotic Christology go hand in hand.¹

CHAPTER IV

GORE'S PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS

If on the one hand Gore was responsible for linking the Catholic Movement in the Church of England to Biblical Criticism, he was instrumental on the other in wedding it to Idealistic Philosophy. Just as he adopted much of the thought of the Biblical-Critical School, so he made the concepts of the Idealists integral to his thinking. Gore's concept of reason is almost identical with that of Coleridge. Reason for both Gore and Coleridge is man's faculty for the apprehension of truth. It is a property containing the image of God within man, and the "supreme reason" is God. Again, Gore has much in common with Jowett. Both Jowett and Gore see God revealed in the natural world. For both, natural law is the expression of the will of God. Also, Gore holds

---

1 As has been pointed out, Idealistic Philosophy in England was integrally bound up with the Biblical-Critical Movement. Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 39 ff., 86 ff.


as does Jowett, that God had revealed Himself gradually and in non-Christian religions.\(^1\) Again, the thought of Gore and Jowett is similar in that, for both, differentiations between the natural and supernatural, except as matters of degree, cease to exist,\(^2\) and in common with his old Master, Gore both loved and lectured on Plato.\(^3\) In addition, Gore owes a great debt in both his epistemological considerations as well as his thoughts in reference to the development of personality to his former teacher, T. H. Green.\(^4\)

It would be wrong, however, to deliver Gore completely into the Idealist camp. It is the essence of Idealism to regard the facts of history as mere accidents—manifestations in time which have their meaning in an eternal reality—an attitude leading eventually to their disregard.\(^5\) However, as has been stated, due to the influence of Westcott, Gore was of the intention at least to take historical facts seri-

---


\(^2\) Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 96 f.


\(^4\) Cf. post pp. 150 ff., 189 ff.

\(^5\) This is well exemplified by Jowett. Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 86, 100.
ously, especially those recorded in the New Testament. This attitude gave Gore's *a priori* Idealism somewhat of an *a posteriori* balancing factor even though, because of his idealistic presuppositions, he was convinced that it was necessary to weave all facts into a rationally coherent context, the basis of which was the reliability of reason in apprehending truth.

In one sense Gore's thought can be seen as the result of a tension between the poles of *a priori* and *a posteriori*. Like Jowett, he had a fundamental distrust of *a priori* and insisted that *a priori* judgments had always to take into consideration the facts of life if the judgments were to be valid. In the Introduction to *The Philosophy of the Good Life*, the Gifford Lectures delivered at St. Andrews University, 1929-30, Gore divides philosophers into two distinct classes, the *a priori* and the *a posteriori*. The first he distinguishes as being the abstract philosophers, examples of which are: John the Scot, to a higher degree St. Thomas Aquinas and Raymond

---


2 Cf. post pp. 149 ff., 172 ff., 198.

3 Cf. Chap. II, ante p. 91. Needless to say, Jowett's distrust of *a priori* did not prevent him from being an almost pure Idealist.


5 Gore also refers to him as John Scotus Erigena, an Irish philosopher who was "a wonderful precursor of Hegel". Gore, *Can We Then Believe?* p. 149.
Lull, and certainly Hegel. On the other hand, there are those whom Gore designates as being dominantly experimental or a posteriori. Examples of this latter category are: Aristotle, who, according to Gore, is "markedly experimentalist on the whole and distrustful of the a priori"; and Joseph Butler, who, Gore points out, "seeks a rational unity in all things", but sticks close to facts and to experience and "disbelieves in the power of the abstract reason and in all a priori schematics". Of Socrates Gore says: "He works on the solid basis of human experience." Plato is pointed out as having a "markedly dogmatic and a priori construction, but at the same time refusing to lose hold on common experience".

1 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, pp. 24 ff. These, he claims, have "a naive belief in the capacity of the human mind to perceive a priori what must have been, and to determine what therefore is the case, without critical examination of the facts". Ibid., p. 25. Cf. Charles Gore, The Holy Spirit and the Church (London: John Murray, 1924), p. 249. Gore attributes to Hegel "an enormous influence on the modern world", and states that his "vision of history as the manifestation of spirit in the threefold movements of thesis, antithesis and synthesis was an intellectual construction which, while no doubt it represents something in actual experience, also largely forced the facts in violation of their natural meaning, into conformity with an a priori assumption". Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 27.

2 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 23.
3 Ibid., p. 24.
4 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 150.
6 Loc. cit.
Gore's own contention is that the test of truth among theories is the capacity which a theory exhibits, or fails to exhibit, to interpret the experience of mankind, its moral and religious experience as well as every other kind of abiding experience. Thus he indicates agreement with Dr. F. R. Tennant whom he quotes as stating:

Philosophy is unavoidably a matter of individual predilection as its whole history reveals, save on the one condition that it sets out from and abides by fact or objective datum, and not from ready made abstractions in which the individual predilection is already involved.

Thus it is clear that Gore's intention is to be empirical or a posteriori as over against a priori. He designates a priori thought with the more or less derogatory term, "rationalism", and would adhere to an a posteriori philosophy, one that would consider all the facts of experience.

1 Ibid., p. 30.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 151.
4 Cf. Ragnar Ökström, The Theology of Charles Gore. (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1944), pp. 43 ff. Ökström in his estimate of Gore's thought is of the opinion that Gore leans heavily on Pringle-Pattison and F. D. Maurice in addition to T. H. Green. Gore does accept certain of Pringle-Pattison's conclusions on emergent evolution, (Gore, Belief in God, pp. 65 ff.) but he rejects Pattison's idea that God is realizing Himself in the world in such a way that He is dependent upon it for His own self-realization. Ibid., pp. 69 ff. It is also true that Gore was influenced by the social consciousness which Maurice instilled into the Church of England, (Frestige, op. cit., p. 17) but in view of the fact that Frestige reports that Gore admits
This is not to indicate, however, that Gore does not admit of presuppositions or of their dangers as far as legitimate conclusions in thought are concerned. He states:

... we are normally born with "pre-judgments" implicit in us ... These implicit pre-judgments appear to belong to our unconscious self in a measure, and they are strengthened by our training and our experience. It is ideal to demand that we should be free of them. They are behind our coldest reasonings as evidently as behind our most emotional or wilful movements.¹

As already stated, Gore, like Coleridge, profoundly believes that man possessed a reasoning faculty with which he could apprehend reality. Also, like Coleridge, who wrote his Aids to Reflection as an instrument to assist those interested in religious subjects and especially ministerial students to regain their faith by appealing not to traditional authori-

---

tative grounds, but to men's reasoning or reflecting faculty,¹ Gore writes the first volume of his "Reconstruction of Belief" entitled, _Belief in God_, for a similar purpose. Gore contends that the traditional grounds for faith had for many been obliterated. He maintains that both Paley's argument from design which supported natural religion as well as the infallible authority of the Scriptures had been destroyed in the estimation of men of science and the mass of educated people because of the advancements of science including Darwinism and Biblical Criticism.² Gore, therefore, makes his appeal:

... to men and women of ordinary intelligence and education, discarding prejudices and arming themselves with nothing but the resolute determination to know and follow the truth ... and seek to build the fabric of a belief which they can feel in their conscience to be reasonable and convincing.³

Like Descartes Gore hopes to lay aside prejudices and presuppositions and "lay the foundation of reasonable certitude and build upon it stage by stage".⁴ He maintains that there must be "deliberate reconstruction of belief from its foundations, inspired by a fearless trust in real freedom of thought".⁵

---

¹ Cf. Chap. II, ante pp. 40 f.
² Gore, _Belief in God_, pp. 5 ff.
³ Ibid., p. 23.
⁴ Ibid., p. 29.
⁵ Gore, _Holy Spirit and the Church_, p. 337.
Presuppositions

In proposing to build upon "foundations of reasonable certitude" Gore begins to show his colours, his presuppositions. His first is his trust in reason. He asserts that "reason is at the last resort our only instrument of truth". He speaks of reason as being "God's original gift to man". Along with conscience, reason is the "image of God in man". It is "a calculating faculty brought to bear on all the crude material of experience so as to discover how best to live". However, reason, for Gore, is not an isolated quality of man, rather: "Our rational or argumentative powers only emerge as an element of the whole cognitive movement of our personality asserting itself".

Gore's second basic presupposition follows from his first. It is that of the essential unity of reality. He states: "It is surely of the essence of reason to demand synthesis", and that though "it may be necessary to entertain contradictory theories simultaneously", they should not be all-

1 Gore, Belief in God, p. 136.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, pp. 182 f.
3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 297; Gore, Belief in God, p. 136.
4 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 327.
lowed "to subvert the essential rational demand for a consistent universe".\footnote{1} Gore points out: "Reason is that in us which demands sequence, regularity, and order in things. It resents mere accident and chance occurrence."\footnote{2} He asserts that "nature is a unity and an order",\footnote{3} that it is "rational through and through, that it corresponds to this fundamental demand of reason, for law and order in all things".\footnote{4} Hence, in line with Jowett, Gore sees reality as a rationally consistent whole.\footnote{5} This idealistic concept of unity causes repercussions to run through the whole of Gore's thought.

**Epistemological Argument**

Once it is assumed that man possesses a reasoning capacity which in turn interprets the universe as a rational order, Gore is certain that a belief in a controlling mind—God—must follow. He quotes Marcus Aurelius as presenting the alternatives:

"The world is either a welter of alternate combination and dispersion, or a unity of order and

\footnote{1} Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 39.  
\footnote{2} Ibid., p. 49.  
\footnote{4} Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 49.  
\footnote{5} In the sense of demanding the unity of all creation Gore, as Jowett, can be designated a Romantic. Cf. Chap. II, ante p. 96.
providence. If the former, why do I care about anything else than how I shall at last become earth? But on the other alternative I feel reverence, I stand steadfast. I find heart in the power that disposes all."¹

Gore agrees with the latter interpretation, and calls this power in the first instance "the universal reason". He states:

This belief in the universal reason, with which our reason holds communion, was the Theism or belief in God of the educated world in which Christianity came. This, it was recognized, is the divine Being in which "we live and move and are." Of this divine Being we, as rational beings, are in a special sense "the offspring."²

To prove his contention that the world must be interpreted in the light of the existence of a divine Being, Gore puts forth his epistemological argument. He maintains that epistemology points to "an original Creative Mind".³ Following Green's argument Gore asserts: "To constitute an object in a world of objects there is needed a mind to hold together in permanent relation the materials of colour, pressure, sound; and smell which come to us through our senses."⁴ Again he states:

¹ Gore, Belief in God, p. 46. Gore cites Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, vi., 10.
³ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 250.
Mind, as it is in me and in all men, not only perceives these things as ready-made, but also has to do with making them to be. God, we commonly say, creates things in nature, and He creates mind. But in fact the two creations are inseparable. The things have no existence apart from the minds which know them, for it is only as held together by the mind of the observer that all the sensations of colour, taste, hardness, softness, shape, etc., coalesce into an object held together in relations [relation] to the whole orderly world. Relations are the work of the mind, and relations are necessary to make objects.1

In addition, Gore asserts that this universal and perfect mind whether it is to be represented as the creator or soul of the "world-reality" "would be instinctively called divine".2

Thus, for Gore, in much the same way as for Green, epistemology is a basis for metaphysics.3 Again, like Green, Gore explains that the same mind which makes possible the relation between phenomena is the "divine mind which is communicating with me through all the processes of sensitive experience".4 Following from this Gore can say: "In knowing more about the world I am learning about God."5

3 Cf. Gore, Belief in God, pp. 34, 52; Chp. II, ante p. 104.
4 Gore, Belief in God, p. 51. Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 105 f. Green's explanation is that knowledge is possible through the universal mind reproducing itself in the human soul.
5 Gore, Belief in God, p. 51. Though Gore is definitely influenced by Green and makes a direct reference to Green's
However, Gore is not satisfied with quitting what may be
called his "natural argument" for the existence of God with
his epistemological considerations. He also sees God as ne-

Prolegomena to Ethics, Book I, Chap. I in his Bampton Lectures.
In his Gifford Lectures he claims some difference in his and
"the Idealists'" epistemological conclusions. Gore, Philosophy
of the Good Life, p. 252. Though, as indicated, in Belief in
God he adheres to the idealistic conclusion that the process
of knowledge consists in the universal mind gradually communic¬
ating itself to the particular mind, in his Gifford Lectures
Gore claims a difference between himself and the Idealists
maintaining that "the sensations dictate the mental result".
Ibid., p. 253. However, Gore constantly agrees with Green that
the "synthetic unity of apperception" constructs the object
perceived. Cf. Loc. cit.; Chap. II, ante p. 103. This change of
opinion which Gore demonstrates would seem to be the basis for
Ekström, in his discussion of Gore's epistemology, asking wheth¬
er Gore does not stop short of the rational principle in the
universe expressing itself in the human mind. Ekström points
out that Gore assumes only a pre-established harmony between
the rational principle and human reason and that man's reason,
which emerges in the process of creative evolution, discovers
the rational in nature. Therefore, he explains Gore's episte¬

ology as "determined by Green as modified by the philosophy
of emergence". Ekström, op. cit., p. 47.

It should be pointed out, however, that Green, too, has a
type of "emergent philosophy" perhaps better named a "progres¬
sive philosophy", the gist of which is that, due to the self-
realization of the eternal spirit in the world, which in man
is man's self-realization, man is ever in a state of progress.
Cf. Chap. II, ante pp. 103 ff. Nor does Green deny evolutionary
would certainly admit that the meaning of earlier processes are
seen in the later, (Cf. Chap. II, ante p. 106) one of the char¬
acteristics by which Ekström distinguishes Pringle-Pattison's
philosophy of emergence. Cf. Gore, Belief in God, p. 59; Ek¬
ström, op. cit., p. 41. The crux of the matter is that both
the philosophies of Pringle-Pattison (Cf. Gore, Belief in God,
p. 69) and Green depend on the immanetism of the eternal
spirit. For Gore's judgment of Pringle-Pattison's philosophy
cf. Belief in God, pp. 65, 69. The difference is that Green's
immanence is perhaps somewhat more direct while, for Pringle-
Pattison, the universal mind manifests itself in the world by
means of an evolutionary process. Therefore, though Gore's
cessary for beauty. He illustrates with a passage from Wordsworth:

"sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns
And the round ocean and the living air
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man--
A motion and a spirit which impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

Gore also utilizes the argument from "moral sense" as a further indication that God exists stating: "For most of us the strongest argument for God is the argument from conscience to a righteousness which is absolute and divine." Hence, Gore plainly accepts much of what he calls "the higher pantheism", a philosophy the main tenet of which is that there is within the world an "eternal and universal Spirit". "This is the immanent God--God in all things and in us."

Epistemology can be characterized, as Ekström claims, "determined by Green as modified by the philosophy of emergence", (Ekström, op. cit., p. 47. Cf. post pp. 158 ff.) it is nevertheless the result of the eternal spirit's manifesting itself to the mind of man whether through a process of evolution or not.

1 Gore, Belief in God, p. 54, quoting Wordsworth, "Tintern Abbey". Gore has "minds of men".
2 Ibid., p. 55.
3 Ibid., pp. 54 f.
4 Ibid., pp. 57 f.
5 Ibid., p. 58.
However, this higher pantheism or natural religion is, for Gore, not a completely satisfactory explanation of the reality of things.\(^1\) It is unsatisfactory not because it is not true, but because it is not complete.\(^2\) Gore holds that God not only realizes Himself in the world, but that He transcends the world, that He is "free and perfect in Himself," before ever the world was, its Creator and its Lord,\(^3\) whereas he explains that the believers who hold only "the higher pantheism" such as Dr. Pringle-Pattison, tie God to the world in such a manner that they do not succeed in asserting the divine transcendence.\(^4\) Gore would have it that God is transcendent over nature, perfect and complete in Himself, as well as immanent in nature.\(^5\)

Emergent Evolution

Bound up with Gore's acceptance of God's immanence in

\(1\) Gore, Belief in God, p. 61.


\(3\) Gore, Belief in God, p. 62.

\(4\) Ibid., p. 64. Cf. Appendix on Pringle-Pattison's article, "Immanence and Transcendence", ibid., pp. 69 ff.

\(5\) Green also declares God to be complete. Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 106 ff.
nature is his concept of evolution. In this matter he quotes Bergson (who, he says, has "given effective expression to a set of ideas which are destined to dominate") as stating:

"I see in the whole evolution of life on our planet a crossing of matter by a creative consciousness, an effort to set free, by force of ingenuity and invention, something which in the animal still remains imprisoned, and is only finally released when we reach man."  

Hence, Gore attributes to God "not only unity and consciousness and priority of existence, but creative will and purpose." Further, Gore is convinced that though the mind of man "emerged" out of nature, man is not to be explained in the terms of that out of which he emerged. Rather the opposite is the case. "The whole process of physical evolution is to be seen in terms of that in which it culminates, that is mind." When mind in man emerges in the process of creative evolution, then and only then, does the secret of nature begin to be recognized." Therefore, Gore agrees with Dr.

1 Gore, _Belief in God_, p. 59.
3 Gore, _The Philosophy of the Good Life_, p. 245.
4 Gore, _Belief in God_, pp. 58 f.
5 _Ibid._, p. 59.
6 _Loc. cit._
Fringle-Pattison that "'Man is organic to nature'"; and he avows:

In fact, we are driven back for our interpretation of nature upon the principle first clearly enunciated by Aristotle that the essence of anything, or its real meaning, is only manifest when it has reached its full growth. We are to interpret the beginning in the light of the end; not the end in the light of the beginning.2

Gore's acceptance of emergent evolution as an explanation of the action of God in the development of the world has consequences far reaching beyond its simply being the grounds by which a universal mind can be substantiated. As stated, because Gore holds that God is perfect and complete in Himself, he disagrees with Fringle-Pattison's explanation that God is completing Himself in the finite ("a quest for self-completion"3). Rather, Gore contends that God is perfect and complete. "The universe does not exhaust Him, or limit Him."4 It is neither true that "'all is God'" or that "'God is all'".5 But: "God is in the world in all its parts and at every moment, revealing Himself in varying degrees in all its force, and cr-


2 Ibid., p. 60.


5 Loc. cit.
der, and beauty, and truth, and goodness."¹ "He is in all, but also over all, supreme and free."² For Gore, then, it is a case of the complete God gradually completing creation through a process of emergent evolution.

Though Gore maintains that God is in no way antagonistic to natural law, "the very being of God is law and order",³ again, "Ordinarily, a known law of the physical world is a declaration of the will of God",⁴ his concepts of emergent evolution lead him to declare that nature is not uniform in the sense that the future has always resembled the past"⁵ Rather, God, who is the author of nature, is capable of acting along particular channels.⁶ Gore maintains:

"The uniformity of nature" is the exhibition of His [God's] perfect orderliness. But the principle of the order of nature is now seen to be not blind mechanism, but the perfect reason and perfect free will of the supreme God the Creator.⁷

"Nature is a progressive order: it admits of new departures,

³ Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 236.
⁴ Gore, *Lord's Prayer*, p. 27.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 236 f.
sudden rises of level, new phenomena." Thus, God is capable of "miraculous" or "abnormal" action, for it is "the very mark of rational power . . . that, under exceptional circumstances, it is not tied to uniformity of custom".

Here Gore's concept of evolution comes into focus. "The original creative act of God was . . . the creation of something germinal, which would gradually unfold into the differentiated world of life, as we know it." He states:

We are bound to think of it [nature] as disclosing successive layers or stages, each successive layer or stage exhibiting laws or phenomena of its own, which from the point of view of the lower level would appear miraculous.

Thus plants arose out of a mechanical universe with new laws; they with the beasts are miraculous to inanimate nature. Likewise human rational beings are miraculous from the point of view of merely animal life. The evolutionary process was not, however, finished with man's creation; and though Gore asserts:

2 Gore, Belief in God, p. 237.
3 Ibid., p. 239.
4 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 151.
5 Gore, Belief in God, p. 243.
6 Loc. cit.
7 Loc. cit. Thus, in this sense, miracle is, for Gore, simply that which is not understood.
"We are bound to discern in nature a gradually emergent purpose which becomes evident only in rational man,"¹ he also insists: "Man, again, was not created perfect, but with such equipment as would enable him to advance to perfection."² Thus he declares:

Nothing, it seems to me, can coincide better with the Christian idea of the purpose of creation and the method of redemption than the modern scientific category of evolution, for which indeed it would seem as if Christianity was always waiting ... creation presents itself to our minds in levels—-inorganic, vital, conscious, spiritual—each of which only reveals its true purpose when, in the order of development, it is made the organ of the higher—matter the organ of life, life of mind, mind of spirit—until finally man, the highest level of microcosm of creation as we know it, finds his perfection only in becoming the organ of God.³

Again:

God may ... must, be conceived of as prior to creation or nature, complete in Himself. But creation, or the process of nature, is a continuous process in which it is the purpose of God to reproduce in a gradual order, and finally, at least, by co-operation of free spirits, an expression of His being and will.⁴

Of tremendous import for Gore's theology is the fact that the Incarnation, too, fits into the evolutionary context. Gore writes: "In the same way, when Christ came, in His person was a new relation of life and mind to matter, and He would natu-

1 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 219.
2 Ibid., p. 151.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 176 f.
4 Gore, Belief in God, p. 291.
ral as a 'new creation,' exhibit a new kind of control over nature. Thus Christ is a "new relation of the Creator Spirit, the Spirit of Life, to matter, a new level in the evolution of life."2

... Christ is supernatural from the point of view of mere man, because in Him the divine Being who had been always at work, in physical nature as 'the persistent energy of all things,' and in human nature as the rational light of man, here assumes humanity, spirit and body, as the instrument through which to exhibit with a new completeness and in a new intensity His own personality and character.3

Another evolutionary level can be said to have been reached in Christ's resurrected body of which Gore says: "His spiritual body was material indeed, but it was one in which matter was wholly subservient to spiritual purpose, and no longer in any way an impediment or a restraint."4

A Revealing God

However, Gore holds that God is not only a creating God, He is a revealing God. God reveals Himself in nature.5 "We are bound to think of a self-revealing God in some sense self-revealing in nature as a whole—in its law, in its order, in

2 Gore, Belief in God, p. 241.
3 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 35.
4 Gore, Belief in God, p. 269 f.
5 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 58 f.
its beauty—self-revealing with extra-ordinary intensity in conscience".\(^1\) God also reveals Himself directly. Gore insists that revelation in the prophets was not the conclusion of reasoning,\(^2\) nor derived from a foreign source,\(^3\) but was "a 'downrush from the superconscious'—the voice of the Spirit of God".\(^4\) Further, Gore insists that in His revelation God revealed His character. He declares that the prophets did not only maintain a God who was an abstract quality such as beauty, justice, and truth, but that the God of the prophets was personal or "superpersonal", a God who willed, acted, loved, hated, judged and blessed.\(^5\) Again he states: "The God of Israel is personal . . . He is the absolute Being . . . He is in character perfect holiness and love . . ."\(^6\)

In the same manner as Frederick Temple in his essay in *Essays and Reviews*, Gore asserts that God's revelation of Himself was of a gradual nature, given for the purpose of the gradual moral education of the race.\(^7\) Gore avows that since

---

1 Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 67.
2 Ibid., p. 97.
3 Ibid., p. 101.
4 Ibid., p. 106.
5 Ibid., p. 113.
7 Cf. Chp. II, ante pp. 73 f., 82 f.; Chp. III, ante p. 123.
God works with a universal spirit: "It is a grave mistake to minimize the borrowings of Judaism, or later of Christianity." He declares that God's positive inspiration is "by no means confined to Israel," and that something about God's character "became apparent to deep-thinking men, like Zoroaster, and Aeschylus, and Plato, all the world over." Therefore, Gore sees Zoroaster as inspired as the prophets of Israel. In Mohammedanism he finds "the principle of brotherhood." He asserts that the Hebrews borrowed from the Babylonian culture and were influenced by the "legislation of Hammurabi." Thus God has disclosed Himself directly to Zoroaster, Mohammed, as well as to Israel's prophets and Jesus of Nazareth. Further, for Gore, Old Testament revelation, which was presented gradually, culminates in the prophets who with Christ present the highest type of ethical monotheism and a personal God.

... the Bible is a great book of development: it

1 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 147.
2 Ibid., p. 237.
3 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 4.
4 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 147.
5 Ibid., p. 108.
6 Ibid., p. 145.
7 Ibid., pp. 235 f.
8 Ibid., p. 151.
9 Ibid., p. 271.
has taught the world the doctrine of development. God's ways are gradual; the Bible is a record of a gradual education for a universal purpose or function.1

Hence, Gore's position is that revelation is gradually given and attains completeness and finality with Christ.2

Thus there is disclosed in Gore's thought a distinct parallelism between his concepts of evolution and direct revelation. Both have God as their author or source, both are accomplished gradually, and both have their climax in Christ. In a real sense, they are of a single piece, both are revelation. For God, who is transcendent and acting from without, is also "immanent and inwardly operative".3 Hence, "grace is not contrary to nature",4 but "nature and grace, creation and redemption are one".5 Thus Gore can say:

First, then, nature is a unity and an order. In nature there can be nothing detached, disconnected, arbitrary, as Aristotle said of old, like an episode in a bad tragedy. Secondly, nature, on the whole, represents a progress, an advance. There is a development from the inorganic to the

---


2 Cf. Gore, Belief in God, p. 294; Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 7; Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 258.

3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 300.


5 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 20.
organic, from the animal to the rational—a progressive evolution of life. Thirdly, this development, from any but the materialist point of view, is a progressive revelation of God.¹

Again, Gore asserts: "If the Word or Son reveals God through the Incarnation, He has previously revealed Him in the body of nature through its beauty, its order, its power."²

Christ has been at work, moving by His Spirit in the consciousness of man, so that the whole moral development of mankind, the whole moral education of the human race, is of one piece from end to end. There moves in it the same Spirit, there expresses itself the same Word.³

Therefore, Gore is perfectly consistent when he maintains that what is highest in nature is the best image of God.⁴ He states that man's nature is "godlike",⁵ and: "So holy is this human flesh, this thing of matter and form, that the Son of God has taken it for ever into His own person, and glorified it in the Godhead."⁶

Hence, God reveals Himself immanently in nature and through the words of His prophets and the person and work of Christ. The development culminates in the Incarnation, for

¹ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 32.
² Ibid., p. 41.
⁵ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 325.
Christ is "the crown of nature; He is thus profoundly natural," 1 "the climax of creation as well as redemption," 2 In that the Incarnation can be seen as either or both the result of emergent evolution and a direct act of God, for Gore, any real distinction between natural and supernatural is obliterated. He writes:

... if we seek with Aquinas to draw the line between the elements in our belief which are natural and supernatural, we shall probably find ourselves baffled in the attempt ... 3

Reason

The real basis for Gore's demand for reality being a unity, hence for his identification of the natural and the supernatural, is centred in his concept of reason. As he explains in his epistemological considerations, reason demands there being a mind on which the world depends. Further, it is by sharing in the universal mind that man is enabled to apprehend reality. 4 Hence, reason, for Gore, is integral to both God and man. God is the "eternal not ourselves", which is at

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 34.
3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 300. For a further discussion on Gore's concept of "nature" cf. post pp. 164 ff.
4 Cf. ante pp. 150 ff.
once reason and beauty and goodness".\(^1\) God is the "supreme reason".\(^2\) Also, reason is an essential part of man's personality. Gore states: "Our rational or cognitive powers only emerge as an element in the whole cognitive movement of our personality asserting itself."\(^3\) Further, Gore asserts that "the Self is a divine reality".\(^4\) Thus, the image of God in man is "both rational and moral",\(^5\) and reason is "the light of God within us".\(^6\) Again, Gore declares that the divine Being at work in human nature is "the rational light of man".\(^7\)

**Reason and Revelation**

The oneness which Gore imposes upon reality influences his concept of revelation. Since both reason and revelation are of God there is, for Gore, no "sharp contrast" between them.\(^8\) He states:

We must not indeed allow ourselves to put rea-

\(^{1}\) Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 133.

\(^{2}\) Gore, *Can We Then Believe?*, p. 32.

\(^{3}\) Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 43. Text has "cognitive".


\(^{5}\) Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 118.


\(^{7}\) Gore, *The Incarnation*, p. 35.

son and revelation into opposition the one to the other. Revelation can come only from God, who is the supreme reason, and can only address itself to the reason in us, which is also God's gift; and, on the other hand, there is perhaps no reasoning process which does not involve some element of revelation in reaching its conclusion.  

Therefore, Gore can say that we have in our reason and conscience "something which testifies to the character of God." He can likewise assert that it is the function of natural reason and conscience in all men everywhere to "seek God."

Gore declares that the Apostle Paul maintained that "man by his reason and conscience . . . might 'feel after God and find Him'--could arrive at the discovery of God." Gore is certain that God cannot crush reason or conscience, for "reason must be able to understand revealed truth," and God must justify Himself to man's conscience. Hence, he adjures that Christ had to fit into a context of a rational order or man's reason would have been "rightly staggered and rebel-

---

1 Gore, 'Can We Then Believe?' p. 32.
2 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 297.
5 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 299.
6 Ibid., p. 296. Gore here professes agreement with Hermann Lotsa.
7 Ibid., p. 298.
In that Gore holds that the self-disclosure of God "augments the light of reason", he does not allow, at least formally, that reason has the last word as far as completeness is concerned. He avows that God's self-disclosure supplies us with "fuller data concerning God than our groping intelligence could have arrived at by itself". Nevertheless, the divine word must "correspond to, and crown the best intimations of human reason". Hence, it would seem that reason is after all primary. Therefore, Gore holds that the teachings of Scripture must be practically and intellectually tested.

He states:

... the best evidence that the message of the Church is really the word of God lies in its being able to liberate and satisfy the reason which is God's original gift to man.

**Reason and Faith**

Because Gore holds no contradiction between reason and revelation, the natural and the supernatural, he maintains

3 Gore, *Can We Then Believe?* p. 171.
also that reason and faith cannot be at odds with one another. Gore describes the commonly held antithesis between faith and reason as being "dangerous" and "unscriptural".¹ This contrariety between faith and reason is quite impossible for Gore because he sees faith as "only reason in the making".² In his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans wherein he is forced by the nature of his subject to be quite Biblical, Gore defines faith as "the faculty of mere reception and correspondence [which] represents the normal and rational relation of man to God, his Creator, Sustainer, Father".³ Again he states: "The faith' in Acts (vi. 7, xiii. 8, xiv. 22, &c.) means this Christian attitude toward the unseen but living and energizing Christ."⁴ However, most generally Gore places faith on a purely natural-rational basis. "Faith is at the very foundation of reason and its constant accompaniment ..."⁵ It is "a primary and constant constituent of reason".⁶ Gore asserts not only that "faith is rational",⁷ but that it is the out-

¹ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 92.
³ Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 63.
⁴ Ibid., II, Note B, 206.
⁵ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 341.
⁶ Ibid., p. 342.
⁷ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 94.
growth of the survival instinct illumined by reason and consisting in the presuppositions that life is good and nature dependable.\(^1\) Carrying through with this latter definition, Gore maintains that the faith of the Christian is similar to or identical with that of natural science. It is "a certain trust in nature--that nature will prove 'reasonable', or will behave in such a way as corresponds with the demands of reason for a certain order or uniformity".\(^2\) Hence, science, according to Gore, did not dispense with the attitude of "credō ut intelligam".\(^3\)

Thus, we see that, for Gore, there is no conflict between faith and reason because faith is nothing more than a necessary postulate of reason, an attitude of trust in presuppositions. Faith is simply a necessary part of the whole rational context, and reason is supreme. Gore writes:

\[\ldots\text{ I cannot allow any antithesis between faith and reason; for no satisfying account can be given of the soul or self of man which does not recognize in faith a primary function of reason.}^4\]

Faith is an ability to trust presuppositions to the point of being able to act upon them. Hence, Gore states:

It is faith by which we welcome the absolute validity

\(^1\) Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 320.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 323.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 324.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 327.
of moral values. It is the same faith by which we recognize God and accept His self-revelation. The spirit of venture—the venture which goes beyond the demonstrative evidence—something of the nature of Pascal's famous "wager" . . .

The Place of Knowledge

Gore maintains that just as there can be no contradiction between faith and reason, there can be none between faith and knowledge. He insists that since God is the source of all truth "we should recognize the unity of all truth". He is certain that a believer in God "must feel that it would be an intolerable situation if he were to find himself in antagonism to the really authoritative disclosures of one of the physical sciences—for natural science is from God as truly as the prophetic word". Gore points out that, according to the Apostle Paul, "the gift of 'wisdom' and the gift of 'knowledge' are among the gifts of the Spirit of God, as well as the gift of

1 Ibid., p. 341. Though Gore would fain remain exegetically true and retain the Pauline differentiation between faith and works, the fact that in his exposition of the Letter to the Romans he states: "It is faith only, and not works, however splendid, which justifies or enables God to take a man", (Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 170) indicates that he does not really understand the differentiation between faith and works since he makes God dependent upon a prior activity of man. This places what he calls "faith" in the category of works no matter what its name.

2 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 49.

3 Ibid., p. 70.

Therefore, truth is not confined to any special revelation.

A rational believer in the Christian revelation . . . will not be content without satisfying himself that his faith leaves him free in the whole world of truth, from whatever quarter it comes and by whatever method it has been attained. 2

Hence, the rational believer is free for all truth. 3

This thinking is in line with Gore's contention that the universe is a rational whole, being of the one universal mind, and, therefore, no fact can stand outside the rational context. 4 Hence, a reasonable faith must take all facts into consideration, 5 the facts of revelation as well as of nature. Therefore, Gore asserts that man must learn to submit to good evidence. 6 He insists "that the whole of our mental or spiritual capacities must be trained and brought into exercise if we are to be true to the whole of reality", 7 and in that he holds to the historical validity of the New Testament reports, this

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 188.
2 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 166.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Charles Gore, Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation (London: John Murray, 1895), p. 216.
5 Gore claims that Christianity is rational because "it and it alone enables us to give a rational account of all the facts of the world". Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 96.
7 Gore, Belief in God, p. 40.
means submission to the facts of miracles as actual happenings.

As against the presuppositions of science which would rule out the possibility of the miraculous events, Gore asserts that the Gospel narratives cannot be rejected on a priori grounds.\(^1\) He maintains that the postulates of each branch of science are relative to its own sphere,\(^2\) and just as "biology demands new categories which physics and chemistry cannot supply,"\(^3\) so the working postulate of the closed system of nature used in physics and chemistry are not valid for the whole of existence.\(^4\) Hence, in the light of Christ, the scientists' closed universe, which is useful as a working postulate, cannot be taken as a final description of reality.\(^5\) Therefore, scientific presuppositions cannot be allowed to rule out the possibility of miracles.\(^6\)

Gore maintains that in order to be reasonable, faith and reason must conform themselves to the nature of the object under consideration. In that Gore asserts that Christ is a

\(^1\) Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 41.
\(^2\) Gore, Belief in God, p. 292.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 244.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 234.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 251.
new nature, "very God made man",\(^1\) he also maintains that extraordinary actions as well as miraculous birth must be considered natural to him.\(^2\) He declares that Christ "is a new thing in nature, a new relation of the Creator Spirit, the Spirit of Life, to matter, a new level in the evolution of life, such as would naturally exhibit new phenomena".\(^3\) Therefore, Gore states:

From this point of view "the works" of Christ are natural in His case—the natural outflowings of the power which He alone, or He first, possessed. It was "natural" that He, being what He was, should so be raised from the dead, as is related in the Gospels. In a phrase of Athanasius's, it is all "in rational sequence"—it is what would be expected in the case of such a person.\(^4\)

Thus, miracles for Gore are part of the rational context;\(^5\) therefore, to believe them is reasonable and conversely rejection is unreasonable. Hence, reason cannot reject Christ and the prophets.\(^6\)

Because of his strong insistence that all truth is essen-

\(^1\) Gore, Belief in God, p. 241.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 241 ff.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 241. Cf. Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 22.
\(^4\) Gore, Belief in God, p. 241. Gore uses "Athanasius's".
\(^5\) Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 94.
\(^6\) Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 339. Gore holds that the decisions of the early Church Councils were less intellectual but more rational than the teachings of the heretics. Gore, The Incarnation, p. 110.
tially a unity Gore believes it wrong to compartmentalize the findings from different fields of thought.¹ Just as he asserts that "it is the primary challenge of reason that we should recognize the unity of all truth",² he argues that all fields of thought must be unified.³ Accordingly, Gore desires a Christian philosophy which would be "a philosophical expression of the Christian creed such as would prove that creed not only to be in harmony with science, but also to be capable . . . of providing . . . a philosophy, or synoptic rationale of the universe of things".⁴ He praises the synthesis between Greek philosophy, both Platonic and Stoic, and Christian thought in the theology of the Greek Fathers as well as that effected by Thomas in the thirteenth century,⁵ and maintains that we have need for a like synthesis between Christian thought and modern knowledge in our day,⁶ one that will account for the facts of nature and history, of experience in the widest sense of the word.⁷

¹ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, pp. 3 f.
² Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 49.
³ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 3.
⁴ Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 179.
⁵ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 301.
⁶ Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 166.
... what is needed is that religious belief should vindicate its reasonableness afresh, and its consistency with the whole of knowledge and experience. Indeed, if religious authority is to be true to its own best traditions, its validity must be vindicated, not only by showing its power to inspire and redeem human life, but also by demonstrating its adequacy in the court of reason and free enquiry; as was done of old, when it succeeded in making of Platonism the instrument of its own theology, and later in converting the revived Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages.¹

Hence, Gore maintains that the facts of revelation should be used as "new data for philosophy".²

Gore's most profound thought in this section would seem to be his insistence that reason and faith must conform to facts in order to be valid. In that Gore accepts the historical validity of the New Testament narratives, it is this attitude which keeps him, at least formally, orthodox. However, it must also be pointed out that because his idealistic presuppositions force him to view the whole of reality as a rational whole, his recourse to historical fact is not really final. In maintaining that a thing historically witnessed to must be credible,³ Gore places presuppositions of credibility above fact. Credibility, for Gore, is a matter of probabil-

¹ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, pp. 337 f.
³ Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 24.
Hence he states:

I would have you ask for good evidence for any historical event claimed to be 'of faith.' But at the same time I would have you realize that historical evidence is never demonstrative. If we are to accept it, there must always be in our minds some sense of probability—some sense of a world order into which the event can fit.

Thus, if Gore would carry his thoughts out to their logical extremes, he would have to conclude that the validity of reason and faith is not really dependent on historical fact at all because historical fact is dependent on probability, i.e. reason. Reason is valid according to a rational whole, the first presupposition of which is the adequacy of reason to apprehend truth; hence, reason is dependent on reason. Because Gore has begun within the rationalistic circle, he cannot escape from it. Truth is what is reasonable. Again, besides applying tests of history, he attempts to use the test of rational coherence, but this, too, necessarily depends on presuppositions.

However, Gore is too much of an empiricist not to realize the fallibility of human reason as we know it. He speaks of "correct reason" and of man recognizing his "better rea-

2 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 95.
3 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, pp. 221 ff.
4 Cf. Gore, Belief in God, p. 33; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 4; Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 166; Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 189.
son". Also, he asserts that "human reason is partial and imperfect", but that the fact that this statement is immediately followed by, "and a self-disclosure of God is easily conceived which should not violate but augment the light of reason", indicates that, for Gore, the imperfection of human reason is simply partially or a state of being incomplete rather than being contrary to reality or false. Hence, he states: "It is the reasonableness of reason to accept ignorance, inevitable ignorance, as a condition of our present imperfect condition." He also contends that "our Lord never yielded Himself up to fallible human reasonings". Similarly to Green, he asserts that man "cannot reach the absolute or divine point of view", but that in order to be rational, we "are brought more or less fully into contact with God and eternity". Hence, one's rationality is dependent on his nearness to God.

The Place of Morality

To be brought into contact with God is not only to be

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 181.
2 Gore, Belief in God, p. 74.
4 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 338.
5 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 199.
7 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 93.
reasonable but to be moral as well. Faith, Gore claims, generates moral capacity, and lifts mankind permanently to a higher level. He maintains that the presuppositions of ethical idealism are also those of Christian ethical teaching, though he adds, "The latter go farther than the former." Hence, for Gore, morality plays as important part in the determination of truth as it does in determining valid faith or religion.

It is not too much to say that the primary value of religion is, for Gore, ethical value. Gore praises Mohammed and Zoroaster for the ethical values in their teachings. The uniqueness of Judaism is, Gore maintains, the ethical religion of the prophets, and Christianity is named "the highest type of ethical monotheism", Christ being the last great moral teacher as well as "the embodiment of the moral ideal". Therefore, "Christianity supersedes all other religions by its very nature—not by excluding but by including the elements of truth which they all contain." Hence, Gore contends that

1 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 296.
2 Ibid., p. 224.
3 Ibid., pp. 107, 147. Gore uses "Muhammed".
4 Ibid., pp. 143 f.
5 Ibid., p. 227.
6 Ibid., p. 220.
7 Ibid., p. 231. Cf. Ibid., p. 271.
8 Ibid., p. 310.
Christianity adopted the moral law of natural religion¹ and exceeds it by the addition of Christ, the moral ideal in the perfect human life.² By the same token, Gore interprets Christ's teaching as being primarily moral, presenting a way of life.³ Therefore, he holds that the Church was established to exhibit a new pattern of human life,⁴ and he considers it the first duty of the Church "to re-erect the ethical standard of Christianity".⁵

Further, Gore's notion of moral perfection is that of a gradual process just as are his concepts of evolution and revelation. Thus, though Christianity is essentially final, it is "only the starting point of a new creation which is a process as gradual as was the old".⁶ The goal of man's Christian development is to become Godlike—to become fully the image of God, to become completely a son of God, i.e. to reach the moral level shown in the Incarnation. Gore holds not only that the supreme evidence of the real moral likeness of man to

¹ Ibid., p. 317.
² Ibid., pp. 317 f.
⁴ Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 116.
⁵ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 350.
⁶ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, pp. 310 f. For Gore, the new creation has reference to the Church, the old creation to Israel.
God lies in the occurrence of the Incarnation and that "in the person of the Incarnate we see how true it has been all along that man is in God's image," but "man is made in God's image; he is in his fundamental capacity a son of God, and he becomes so in fact, and fully, through union with Christ." "It is the inward presence of Jesus Christ . . . that makes His example always, for the sons of faith, practical and realizable."  

... He, whose example we have before our eyes in the pages of the Gospels is working inwardly in our hearts, to purify us gradually and mould us into His own incomparable likeness.

Thus, the chief end of creation which Gore asserts is first glimpsed in the "developed moral consciousness of man", is the development of sons of God. He states:

The culmination of nature was to be a world of free but embodied spirits capable of the intellectual appreciation of goodness, beauty and truth, capable of sonship with God and glad co-operation in the fashioning of the kingdom of God which is the fellowship of love.

2 Ibid., pp. 116 f.
3 Ibid., p. 181.
7 Ibid., p. 278.
Sin

It is in the moralistic context that Gore's concept of sin must be considered. Gore states: "We have to recognize—what is hard to see how any moralist can deny—that human nature, as we have had experience of it in history, presents in a great measure a scene of moral ruin." The basis for this moral ruin is sin. In addition Gore avows: "The more you contemplate from a moral point of view the condition of man, the more luminously certain it becomes that the Christian view of sin is the right one". Hence, Gore declares: "We hold to the doctrine of the Fall, a doctrine, that is, that man's condition has been throughout a parody of the divine intention, owing to the fact of sin tainting and spoiling his development from the root." For Gore, this is hardly "a Fall" in the Biblical sense; however, because he asserts: "We have no reason to think that man was originally created perfect." Thus, Gore holds the Genesis account of "the Fall" as only an illustration of the presence of sin. Sin is a "fall" only in the sense of

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 36.
2 Loc. cit.
its being responsible for the lowering of human life.1

Gore also admits a type of "original sin", calling it "a perverse inclination inhering in the stock of our manhood".2 "Original sin' is not a fixed quantity . . . but is a moral weakness continually reinforced by every actual transgression".3 It is "the universal flaw in human nature".4 Further, Gore holds not that man is subject to original sin because of his nature, but that sin is transferred from one generation to another. "in virtue of the inviolable solidarity of the human race".5 Hence, "every individual is born into an inheritance of sin",6 but individuals start at very different levels of depravity".7 Thus, Gore retains the terminology of the Biblical teaching in reference to the doctrine of sin, but interpolates idealistic meanings into the terms.

Though Gore maintains that sin is not the residue of our animal nature,8 and hence, it is not being gradually outgrown,9

1 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. xv.
2 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note E, 225.
3 Ibid., p. 228.
4 Ibid., p. 221.
5 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. xv.
7 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note E, 223.
8 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 61.
it results in the "denaturalisation" of the individual and society,¹ and is "a corruption of man's true nature".² Gore is, nevertheless, not willing to admit that the nature of sinful man is essentially different than it would be if it were sinless. Thus, when he speaks of nature in connection with sin, he is speaking of an ideal nature. Hence, he states that sin, which has not wholly obliterated but "thoroughly defaced" the image of God in man,³ is not according to man's true nature,⁴ nor is it the "essential constitution" of human nature.⁵ Therefore, for Gore, "sin has no substance; there is no positively sinful nature",⁶ and "sin lies not in things, but in our relation to things".⁷ Further, Gore maintains that "the moral evil of our nature does not properly belong to our nature but is its violation".⁸ Therefore, corruption does not

¹ Gore, Lux Mundi, Appendix II, p. 393.
² Ibid., p. xiv.
³ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 19.
⁴ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 167.
⁵ Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note B, 231.
⁶ Gore, Lux Mundi, Appendix II, p. 390.
⁷ Loc. cit.
⁸ Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note B, 225. In The Philosophy of the Good Life, Gore states: "But the sin which binds him and dooms him lies not in the body or anything which properly belongs to his nature as God made him (there is not a trace of dualism in the teaching of Jesus), but it lies simply in the perverted will—-in 'the heart of man!'", pp. 181 f.
"essentially belong" to men. Hence, the criminal who turns to God is, Gore states, "only reconstructed, not substantially changed".  

For Gore, "there is nothing fundamentally evil but the evil will, as Kant affirmed".  

For Gore, "there is nothing fundamentally evil but the evil will, as Kant affirmed". Hence, the locus of sin is in the will. Sin lies in the perverted will. It is the result of the created will setting itself against the divine will. Sin is "lawlessness". It is humanity in rebellion, "rebellion against God". It is the "misuse" of the good.  

Therefore, the force of sin is, for Gore, in preventing human nature from reaching its ideal state defined in moral terms. Hence, he speaks of sin as "moral failure", as as

1 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note B, 225.  
2 Gore, Lux Mundi, Appendix II, p. 390.  
3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 275.  
5 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 67; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 224.  
7 Ibid., p. 392.  
10 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 391.
"moral weakness", 1 and as a "disordering force". 2 Gore states: "Sin, as such, has always been a source of confusion, not of progress." 3 In a sense, too, sin is ignorance. Gore speaks of sin as "man's refusal to submit himself to his best lights". 4 But sin, Gore holds, has not resulted in an essential change in man's nature, nor has it impaired his reason. Sin is "the privation of order". 5 Thus, it has slowed man's development towards the ideal of his Creator, and it has, therefore, prevented man's realizing his highest goal. Gore states:

Man has been slowly led, or has slowly developed, towards the divine ideal of his Creator; but his actual development has been much less rapid and constant than it might have been, owing to the fact of sin from which he might have been free. 6

Personal Idealism

Integral to Gore's concepts of truth, the good, or moral, are his notions of personality. He states: "I cannot hold the conception of truth or of purpose or of righteousness ex-

---

1 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, Note E, 223.
2 Ibid., p. 231.
3 Gore, Lux Mundi, p. xiv.
5 Gore, Lux Mundi, Appendix II, p. 398.
cept on the background of personality."\(^1\) Here again the deep influence of Green's personal Idealism can be seen. As contrasted with an abstract God, Gore insists that the prophets disclosed a God who was personal.\(^2\) Again, he asserts that Christianity "insists upon and emphasizes the category of personality in man and in God."\(^3\) The personality of God means, for Gore, "a being of deliberate will and energetic action, approving and disapproving, loving and hating, judging and blessing".\(^4\)

The Father is one who wills and does, not merely all things in general, but particular things, who goes out to seek and save individual souls—in short, who is a person.\(^5\)

Further, Gore declares: "God is, in some supreme and transcendent sense, all that we mean when we speak of a person",\(^6\) and: "The human personality is an inadequate image of the divine personality."\(^7\) Also, Gore defines "person" as "a permanent centre of consciousness, will, and feeling".\(^8\)

\(^1\) Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 146.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 113.
\(^3\) Gore, *Can We Then Believe?* p. 169.
\(^4\) Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 113.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 114.
\(^6\) Ibid., pp. 113 f.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 113.
\(^8\) Gore, *Can We Then Believe?* p. 164.
"personality" is equated with the "self". Thus, for Gore as for Green, the essence of personality is self-consciousness.

Of great import to the understanding of Gore is that, agreeing with Green, he considers man's personality in its fulness not as something that he is but something that he is ideally, hence it is to be completed. Gore states: "The closer our union with God, the more intense will our personal life become . . ."  

Christ attends to, respects, develops, educates personality in His little band of apostles; and that because to become like Him, they must realize personality in its depth, its fulness, its distinctiveness. Therefore, to become like Christ is the end of man both in terms of moral achievement and in terms of the advancement of personality. Hence, Gore accepts Green's position that moral values are interpreted in terms of personal advancement, and, in common with Green, he speaks of the growth of personality as "self-realization". For both Gore and Green, the realization of the self is the realization or development of its

1 Gore, Belief in God, p. 43.
3 Gore, Belief in God, p. 165. Green maintains that the more fully God or the Universal Mind reproduces itself in the person, the more fully does the personality realize itself.
4 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 118.
fundamental capacities. Gore states:

It is my sacred duty to make the very best of myself in every one of my various members, qualities, and capacities, so that I may be as fit an instrument as possible for doing God's will.  

Gore, like Green, maintains that self-realization is brought about in virtue of a power not ourselves. Also, following Green, Gore holds that the prerequisite to self-realization is freedom, and the necessary locus of the development of the self in society in which "every man counts for one, and no one counts for more than one". Hence, Gore agrees with Green in maintaining that the individual and society have a mutual relationship. Gore states: "The aim of society is the development of the faculties of each individual, yet man realizes his individuality only by relations to a society." For Gore, this society is the Church. The necessary attitude of each individual in the process of self-realization is that of hu-

2 Gore, Christian Moral Principles, p. 107; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 222; Cf. Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 64.
mility before both God and his fellows.¹ Surrender to the will of God is man's redemption, his self-realization.² Hence, Gore equates self-realization and salvation.³

Further, Gore's thought includes a concept which relates the achievement of personality and rationality, the ability to discern truth. In that all thinking, according to Gore, assumes that the mind of man corresponds "to mind in the universe", that "nature reflects God", and that "the best and fullest reflection or expression of God must be found in nature's highest product--moral personality";⁴ the degree of morality determines the degree of rationality. Hence, the achievement of personality is equated with becoming a Son of God and becoming rational. Therefore, for Gore as for Coleridge, Newman, Jowett, and Green, morality and rationality or truth are finally equated.⁵ Thus, Gore can say, "The Spirit of Christian sonship is the only true rationality."⁶ Hence, Gore has a moralistic criterion of truth.

² Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, pp. 269 f.
³ Ibid., pp. 222 f.
⁵ Cf. discussion on Coleridge, Newman, Jowett, and Green, Chap. II, ante pp. 45, 33, 97 f., 110.
Actually, however, the question as to criterion of truth remains, for within the rationalistic idealistic context, it is quite impossible to determine what comprises a son of God or what constitutes a perfect personality. Judgment is impossible simply because in holding that all existence must be within a rational whole there can be no place for a standard of judgment since a standard must by the nature of its function be apart from the subject which is to be judged. Gore's Christian presuppositions lead him to accept the Person of Christ as his criterion of judgment, but by including the person of the Incarnate within the rational context, he destroys the value of his Christ-standard. The matter reduces itself to one of two alternatives. If Christ possesses a supernatural element that is above nature and reason, then it is quite legitimate to insist reason must conform to Him. If, on the other hand, He is held within the rational context, then reason is supreme and Christ must conform to it. Gore's system makes it necessary for him to hold both the contradictory alternatives. This unresolved difficulty is a direct result of Gore's idealistic concept of reason combined with his great respect for Biblical facts. Reason, for Gore, as before suggested, spans the realms of the natural and the supernatural.

being both a property of God and man. 1

In the light of his concept of reason, it is very difficult to understand how Gore can take seriously his statements that as creator, God is "absolutely distinct" from His creatures and His creation, 2 that the Christian God is "independent of His creation", 3 or that God "is present in all things but unconfused". 4 Gore staunchly maintains that reason is a part of God, that "Christ is the Word", "the Reason of God", 5 even that God is supreme reason. Reason is also a constituent of man, his only faculty of truth, 6 a part of his fundamental self. 7

It would seem that Gore could not have it both ways, that he must either give up reason as an essential to both man and God, or he must in some way identify the two. Idealistic presuppositions, on which hang his whole system of thought, do

---

1 Cf. ante pp. 166 f.
2 Gore, Belief in God, pp. 122 f.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 172.
4 Gore, Belief in God, p. 124.
5 Gore, Sermon on the Mount, p. 6.
6 Gore, Belief in God, p. 133.
7 Ibid., p. 43. Gore criticizes Otto and Barth for stressing the "otherness" of God so heavily as to suggest that "they have overlooked that the voice of God from without or from above must correspond with His voice from within the heart of man in his conscience and reason". Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 239.
not allow him to acquiesce to the former alternative and Christian presuppositions, which induce him to accept Biblical testimony, do not allow him to accept the latter. Hence, he has it both ways and maintains an ambivalence between two irreconcilable poles in the foundation of his thought. He refuses to drive his thoughts to their legitimate conclusions and uncover their inherent contradiction.

As a result Gore's categories have somewhat of a "fuzzy" quality. He vacillates between the poles of Biblical revelation and Idealism as the situation demands. When he deals with historical and Biblical research, he is, to a large extent, accurate, and therefore, his expositions are worthy of serious consideration. They must be judged as Gore would have them judged in the light of the best historical evidence available. However, when he interprets his findings and attempts to reconcile them with his Idealism, the real force of the historical evidence tends to run out into the sand. Hence, in spite of his impeccable honesty and his real attempt to follow the leading of the evidence to the bitter end, his presuppositions do not enable him to allow the real force of the super-

---

1 It would seem that Smades, in his consideration of Gore, failed to appreciate Gore's extremely honest attempt to be historical in his New Testament research and, therefore, writes his conclusions off a little too quickly as being entirely the result of his Idealism. L. B. Smades, The Incarnation: Trends in Modern Anglican Thought (Amsterdam: J. H. Kok N. V. Kampen, 1953), pp. 1 ff., 53 ff.
natural revelation to burst asunder all man made systems and flood his whole thought with the only light Christians can legitimately follow.

**Individualism**

Because Gore has allowed the true meaning of the Incarnation to be tempered by his Idealism, he, like Newman and Jowett, is left with the subjective judgments of his own rational faculties; hence he is, at heart, an individualist. In the preface to his first volume of his "Reconstruction of Belief" he states:

> I have, ever since I was an undergraduate, been certain that I must be in the true sense a free thinker, and that either not to think freely about a disturbing subject, or to accept ecclesiastical authority in place of the best judgment of my own reason, would be for me an impossible treason against the light. I must go remorselessly where the argument leads me.²

Gore insists that it is alien to Christianity to "put a sort of ban on the free life of the intellect".³ He states that Christianity "is totally without obscurantism, and loves light for its own sake from whatever quarter it comes".⁴

Further, Gore is certain that "the only satisfactory way for a man to

---

1 Cf. Chap. II ante pp. 31 ff., 92 ff.
2 Gore, Belief in God, p. x.
3 Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 87.
4 Loc. cit.
save his own soul . . . is freely to use his own real judgment and accept the responsibility of decision”. 1 Gore appeals to men "to think for themselves, and to think freely" rather than confronting them with claims of orthodoxy. 2 Religion, says Gore, "summons each man to judge for himself". 3 Hence, he asserts that the devout Catholic "must be prepared to receive light from every quarter, however hostile, and to follow the light. He must not 'reason in fetters!' The test of the truth of the tradition is that it can bear the whole light". 4 He agrees with Butler that "the principle of reflection or self-judgment, which we call conscience, has by inherent right a supreme authority". 5

However, Gore's individualism on one side runs counter to his orthodoxy on the other. Though he insists that it is necessary to "reverse traditional judgments in religion", 6 and that it is needful "to get rid of everything that makes the sound of religion irrational", 7 he nevertheless wishes to protect the Church standards. He states of the Church minister:

1 Gore, Belief in God, p. 3.
2 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. v.
3 Gore, Belief in God, p. 27.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 109.
5 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 270.
7 Loc. cit.
"If his thought leads him plainly and finally outside the Christian Creed, of course he must cease to hold the office of a Church teacher."¹ Therefore, the legitimate conclusion to Gore's thought would seem to be that though the doctrinal standards of the Church are authentic for the Church, they are valid for the individual only so long and insofar as they agree with individual reason and conscience.

This position is the logical outcome of the contradiction in Gore whereby he maintains a strong doctrinal stand and yet appeals to individual reason as the final court of judgment. Thus, in spite of high opinion of the Church,² Gore does not have recourse to the mind of Christ in the living Church, and he remains in the end an individualist. Hence, to the individualism of the Tractarians is added the individualism of Idealism to form, in Gore at least, the individualism of Liberal or Anglo-Catholicism.³

Though in one sense Gore's whole life was an attempt to reconcile the Creeds of Christendom with modern thought, the fact that he never realized that human nature, and with it human reason, is, as such, inherently sinful, and hence, as such,

¹ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 189. Cf. Ibid., p. vi. Cf. post p. 273. Where reference is made to the instance of Gore's demanding the resignation of one of the members of the clergy of his diocese.

² Cf. Chap. III, ante pp. 120 ff.

inevitably in error until it is conformed to the mind of Christ, not only prevented him from uncovering the basis of the conflict between the creeds and individual reason, but is the direct cause for the contradiction which we have pointed out in his own thought.

Further, though Gore's lack of consistency does not, as we have said, condemn all his theological assertions, it certainly indicates that his or any attempt to reconcile idealistic philosophy, which inevitably identifies God and man through their common property, the reason, with the Christian revelation, which, as Gore has on the basis of Biblical evidence conclusively shown, admits of no identification between creator and creature, is doomed to failure before it begins. Moreover, since all philosophy and human knowledge really rest on the same foundation, that of man's reason, which has no more relation to God than does man's hand, both being attributes of the creature, of fallible fallen nature, any serious attempt to form a Weltanschauung in which the facts of supernatural revelation are treated as data to be reconciled with the results of human reason is bound to result in the distortion of either or both the supernatural element, revelation, or the natural element, man's reason.

1 Cf. W. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914), p. 30, for a like opinion which shows a basic philosophical similarity between Sanday and Gore.
PART II

THE CHURCH
In 1925, seven years before the end of his long life, Charles Gore, having retired from the last of his three bishoprics in order to have the chance of producing some really mature and serious intellectual work, published a little volume entitled, *The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day*. Gore characterizes the purpose of the movement thus: "It was to re-establish in the minds of churchmen the idea of the Catholic Church, of which the Church of England claimed to be a living part." He points out the central idea maintained by the Anglo-Catholic movement was that:

... Jesus Christ, our Lord, had in one sense accomplished at His Ascension in His single Person the redemption of man. But in another sense, equally apparent in the New Testament, he had only provided in full measure the means for its accomplishment, leaving behind Him for the fulfilment of his purpose the church ... the visible organ through which He is to act upon the world.

---


3 Prestige, *op. cit.*, pp. 421 f.


Further, Gore asserts that the Tractarians set out to make the three institutions, "the common creed", "the common Sacraments", and "the sacred ministry", "current coin again in the familiar thought and speech of men".\(^1\) It is Gore's claim that the three institutions emphasized by the Tractarians appear in the early Church as "having equal and undisputed authority",\(^2\) "were all retained and emphasized by the Church of England when it became separated from the Roman Church",\(^3\) and are elements of doctrine "of the visible Church--one, holy, catholic, and apostolic".\(^4\) Therefore, he is deeply sympathetic with the Tractarian cause.

The Founding of a Visible Society--The Church

In his doctrine of the Church, Gore would be quite satisfied to be called a loyal son of the Tractarians.\(^5\) He accepts whole-heartedly the Tractarian position that Jesus really was the founder of an institution, the Church.\(^6\) He states:

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 8.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 7.
\(^3\) Loc. cit.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 8.
\(^5\) Cf. Ibid., p. 2.
Indeed, the more we study the Gospels, the more clearly we shall recognize that Christ did not cast His Gospel loose upon the world—the world which was so incapable of appreciating it; that would have been indeed to cast His pearls before swine; but He directed all His efforts to making a home for it . . .

Gore, like the Tractarians, maintained that the Church which Christ founded was a "visible society," a "catholic society". He asserts: "The religion of Jesus Christ appears in history as a visible society, and nothing else than a visible society." He maintains that in the New Testament "there is no mention of any invisible Church in this world", and "that the Church of which S. Paul speaks such glorious
things was the visible society in which the earliest history is given in The Acts".  

Further, Gore insists that the doctrine of the invisible Church "which Luther made popular in the sixteenth century", and "of which the Protestants made so much use, is not the doctrine of the New Testament". In addition, Gore declares that Christ provided his Church with an elementary organization. He maintains that the early Christians expectation of a "speedy dissolution of the world, and the absorption of the Church into the kingdom did not hinder their sense of present duties".

2 Gore, Can We Then Believe?, p. 99.
3 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 11. Gore insists that the doctrine of the invisible Church appears almost to have vanished in his day. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 145. However, his rejection of the distinction between the visible and invisible Church here on earth does not extend to the Church in its entirety. He states: "The visible catholic church is only a part of the whole church. Only the lower limbs of the body of Christ are visible to us. We are in communion also with the dead." Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 96. Again: "The blessed dead are not separated from the Church, they are only the most advanced part of the Church." Charles Gore, The Creed of the Christian (Fifth Edition; London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1895), p. 101. And again: "The Church on earth is but the visible portion of a great invisible whole bound all together in the same order of supernatural life." Charles Gore, Roman Catholic Claims (Seventh Edition; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), p. 35. Also Gore comes very near admitting that there is a possibility of Christians outside the Church when he states: "The Church because of its unfaithfulness and corruption has alienated many who are the friends of Christ". Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 49.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 39.
But as a matter of fact side by side with the eager expectation of the kingdom from heaven, and the dissolution of the present world-order, there had gone on from the very beginning a consistent work of organizing churches as if in preparation for an indefinite future.¹

Moreover, Gore asserts that when Christ left the world, "He left behind Him a certain rudimentary organization already in being".² This rudimentary organization consisted of "the authority of the Apostles—not as witnesses only but as rulers".³ He points out that Christ carefully selected, appointed, and trained the Twelve "to be the 'stewards' of the newly organized household of God",⁴ and made them the centre of His Church.

Our Lord deliberately organized His disciples as 'The Church' and bound them together in obedience to the Twelve.⁵

The Church as a Fellowship

As Gore is certain that the Church in the New Testament which is founded by Christ is a visible society, so he insists


² Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 109.

³ Ibid., p. 13.


that it was a "visible fellowship". He asserts that the kingdom Christ came to inaugurate was to be "a life of fellowship, human and divine", and that Christianity involves "the life of a brotherhood". Further, this Christian society, fellowship, or brotherhood, is an inclusive society to which Christians must belong if they are to be Christian; hence it is "a catholic brotherhood". Gore contends that "in the New Testament we find no trace of individualistic Christianity". He asserts that "to be a Christian is to be within that Apostolic Society", that union with and membership in Christ is indivisible from union with and membership in the Church.

... He [Christ] has willed that the individual should enter into his covenant of communion with

1 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 100.


6 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 245.


8 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 15; Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 12.
Himself only in fellowship with other men, only as a member of a body.\footnote{1}

Moreover, Gore avows that Christ committed His saving truth to the Church.\footnote{2} He maintains that, according to the record in Acts, the Holy Ghost is given "objectively to a definite and visible society ... and to it, as far as it appears, exclusively, and to the individuals only as members of the society".\footnote{3} Hence, the Church is "the only recognized sphere of the spirit's action".\footnote{4}

God's deliverance or "salvation" of mankind is a deliverance of individuals indeed, but of individuals in and through a society; not of isolate individuals, but of members of a body.\footnote{5}

Gore declares: "Corporately man is fallen and corporately he is to be redeemed."\footnote{6} Hence, he agrees with Cyprian whom he quotes as saying: "He cannot have God for his Father who has

\textbf{Notes:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{1} Gore, 	extit{Religion of the Church}, p. 176. Cf. \textit{Ibid.}, p. 39; Gore, 	extit{Jesus of Nazareth}, p. 245.
  \item \textbf{4} Gore, 	extit{Holy Spirit and the Church}, p. 72.
\end{itemize}
The Church as a Unity

Following from Gore's insistence that the Church is a "catholic fellowship",2 "a catholic body",3 is his assertion that it is a single unity. He states: "She is one as the branches are one with the vine."4 There are local churches to be sure and Gore asserts that "the primary importance of the Church's organization is local",5 but he is also insistent that the Christian Churches in the New Testament have a necessary relation to one another. "They constitute together one body; they maintain one tradition, and the test of it is found in their consent; they exhibited, they ought still to exhibit, an unbroken fellowship."6

---

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 16, citing Cyprian, Ep. lxxiv. 7. Gore is certain that the fact of Christianity's being a society, being a social before an individual affair is not contrary to the development of religion in general. He indicates that the whole history of religion emphasizes "the principle that religion is first of all a group consciousness or tribal consciousness, and that individual religion develops later and under its shelter". Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 146. Cf. Ibid., p. 63.

2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 28.


4 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 27.

5 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 58.

6 Loc. cit.
St. Paul meant by 'the Church' in general, a society visible and organized, represented by a number of visible and organized local societies or churches.  

For Gore the one and the many are a single unity; he maintains that the glorious Church spoken of by St. Paul in Ephesians "is the sum of all the members of the local Churches".  

Hence, to be a member of the local Church is to be a member of the "universal ecclesia"; not that the local Churches are federated into a single Church or are component parts of one Church, rather "each church is the church; and the members of each local church are thereby members of the one Church".  

The Church as the New Israel.  

Though Gore insists on the one hand that Christ established the Church, he also states on the other that it is "a mistake to ask whether Christ while on earth founded the Church, for it was already in existence".  

"'The Church' is in the first instance the holy people of God--Israel."  

Christ did not need to orig-

---

1 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 164.  
2 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 99.  
3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 33.  
4 Loc. cit. The unity of the Church is further discussed in Chapter VI, post pp. 259 ff.  
5 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 42. Cf. Ibid., p. 60.  
6 Loc. cit.
inate an institution for it was already in existence, but he needed to reorganize it, to reform it, to profoundly modify and refound it. Thus, rather than founding the Church in the strict sense, Gore maintains that Christ re-founded it as "the New Israel" in the heart of the old. Gore writes:

Jesus then . . . did not found a new Church, but he did refound the old Church on the new basis of faith in His Messiahsdom, and did equip it with teaching, new as well as old, and also, in the persons of the Twelve, with authoritative officers.

Hence, the Church, according to Gore, has a marked continuity with the Old Israel. He expresses this again by asserting that Christ instituted a "New Covenant" which was like the Old in at least three aspects. It is "with a people";

1 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 124.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 72; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 191.
4 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 41; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 48; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 173.
5 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 79. Cf. Ibid., p. 91; Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 35.
6 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 51. Cf. Ibid., p. 103. Gore points out that the parable of the husbandman portrays the relationship between the Old Israel and the New. The vineyard is Israel, the vine-dressers are interpreted as being the rulers of Israel, who are in charge of its destiny. These are rejected and "other husbandmen" put in their places. These are, according to Gore, the apostles. Ibid., p. 46.
7 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 34.
8 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 49.
it was inaugurated by sacrifice; and it has officers and a law.

Further, Gore contends that as under the Old Covenant Israel was "the royal and priestly people" so, since the coming of Christ, "the Catholic Church inherits the 'elect' position of Israel." But whereas the Old Covenant had to do with a single people, the Church "is catholic or universal, a supernatural fellowship, based on the fuller revelation of God which is given us in Jesus Christ." Gore states:

Under the old covenant it was to members of the 'commonwealth of Israel' that the blessings of the covenant belonged. Under the new covenant St. Paul still conceives of the same commonwealth as subsisting . . . and as fulfilling no less than formerly the same religious functions. True, it has been fundamentally reconstituted and enlarged to include the believers of all nations, and not merely one nation; but it is still the same commonwealth, or polity, or church; and it is still through the church that God's 'covenant' dealings reach the individual.

The Christian Church is, then, "the true Israel" as against 'Israel after the flesh'". It is "the New Israel, now freed

---
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, pp. 145 f.
3 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 22.
4 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 9.
5 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 103.
from all restriction of race—the church which is His body, indwelt by His Spirit, the home of 'the grace and truth' which 'came by Him,' and the visible organ through which He is to act upon the world".1 Hence, quoting Justin Martyr, Gore asserts: "Christians are 'the genuine high-priestly race of God'".2

Thus, according to Gore, "the religion of the Spirit in the Church appears in the New Testament as the culmination of the religion of Israel".3 The divine movement had its beginning with the cult of Abraham, its consummation in Christ and the mission of His Spirit, and its development in the history of the Church.4

The Church as the Kingdom of God

Another definition that Gore gives to the Church is, "The Kingdom of God". He avows that in some sense the kingdom had come in Christ's person;5 that "by His Incarnation He inaugurated a kingdom of redemption".6 Further, Gore asserts that

---

2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 29, citing Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 65. Cf. Ibid., pp. 30 f.; Gore, Christ and Society, p. 84.
3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 72.
4 Ibid., pp. 357 f.
5 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 39.
Christ prepared the church to be in some sense the kingdom of God on earth.¹ Hence, he maintains that Christ identifies the kingdom of God with the society He was founding.² Again, he states that the Church "is the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of Heaven, because it is an organized society of men, in which Christ is the Head and King".³

However, Gore also points out that though the kingdom is already among men in virtue of Christ's presence, in another and fuller sense the kingdom comes only with the final and universal triumph of God in Christ.⁴ Therefore, he maintains that in one sense "the Church is the Kingdom of Heaven",⁵ and in another "the Church prepares for the Kingdom rather than is it".⁶ "It represents it in this 'age'".⁷ Thus, "the Church of the Messiah" is "the first stage in the realization of the Kingdom".⁸ The Church is, truly and really the Kingdom of

¹ Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 153.
³ Gore, The Lord's Prayer, p. 43.
⁴ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 61.
⁵ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 43. Cf. Gore, Christ and Society, p. 45.
⁶ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 43.
⁷ Loc. cit.
⁸ Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 119.
God, but it is so within limitations; it represents the kingdom and prepares for the later and fuller representation of it in the universe. In sum Gore writes:

Perhaps on the whole we may say that the kingdom is something larger than the visible church, but that both are of one piece; that the church represents the kingdom in the present world and by its prayers and activities prepared the way for its future coming.

Thus, in a real sense, in spite of his "high" doctrine of the Church, Gore seems to subordinate the Church to the kingdom, though he never makes a cleavage between the two. Gore identifies the full coming of the kingdom with the second coming of Christ.

The Church as the Body of Christ,
The Extension of the Incarnation

Following both the Apostle Paul and the Tractarians,


2 Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 73 f.

3 In his interesting essay entitled, "Kingdom, Church, and Ministry", J. A. T. Robinson, too, seems to give the kingdom preeminence. He asserts: "The Kingdom of God, rather than the people of God, is the controlling category of biblical theology for both the Old and New Testaments." Again, "... the Church is a function of the Kingdom ..." The Historic Episcopate, edited by Kenneth H. Carey (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954), p. 15.

4 Gore, The Lord's Prayer, p. 44. He asserts that the new Jerusalem shall come "by an act of God". Gore, Christ and Society, p. 47.
Lore designates the Church as "the body of Christ." However, for Gore, this is true not in any metaphorical sense nor in any analogical sense, but in the sense of ontological identity. Gore holds that the Church is the body of Christ because: "It is the extension and perpetuation of the Incarnation in the world." 


2 R. L. Mascall agrees saying: "It is not a mere metaphor but literal truth that the Church is the Body of Christ", (R. L. Mascall, Christ, the Christian, and the Church (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1946), p. 112) while Ernest Best points out that there are many metaphors in describing the Church such as "olive tree", "building", "bride"; consequently he asserts that "the Church is not really and ontologically the Body of Christ." Ernest Best, One Body in Christ (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 100.

3 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 219. Cf. Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 45, 173. T. F. Torrance points out that when speaking of the Church as the body of Christ, we are using analogical language, but that there exists behind the analogical language, an "ontological reality of its oneness with Christ in love". However, this oneness in love is, for Torrance, the Church's participation in the humanity of Jesus Christ. He states further: "When Paul speaks of the Church as the body of Christ, he is expressly distinguishing the Church from Christ." This distinction St. Paul illustrates by the analogy of marriage. T. F. Torrance, Royal Priesthood (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1955), pp. 29 ff. P. T. Forsyth states of the Church as the "prolongation of the Incarnation". "It is an attractive imagination." P. T. Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments (Fourth Impression; London: Independent Press Ltd., 1953), p. 81. Again: "The Church is not the continuation of Christ but His creation and response." Ibid., p. 83.
of the life of Christ."

When the Holy Spirit came down from Christ in heaven on the day of Pentecost, He came to fill with Christ's own life the Church which had been already gathered to await His coming.  

Hence, the Church is "the organ of His Christ's continual life among men". "The permanent presence of Christ on earth of which the New Testament speaks is His presence in His body the Church."  

The Incarnate

In order to understand Gore's doctrine of the Church as the extension of the Incarnation, it will be necessary to investigate his interpretation of the Incarnation itself. On the face of it Gore seems to accept the orthodox Chalcedonian definition of Christ as being perfect God and perfect man in one person. He contends that Christ is "of one substance with God". This means for Gore, that Christ belongs to "that one real Being which we call God". Further, he claims that,

1 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 120. Cf. Ibid., p. 76.
3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. ix.
4 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 214.
6 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 234.
according to the Apostle Paul, Christ has divine functions: His blood is God's blood; He is the object of worship;¹ He is "essentially and eternally 'God'".² Again, Gore avows that in St. Paul's writings "occasionally the Lord (Jehovah) and the Lord (Christ) are unmistakably identified".³ Gore states:

There can be no middle term between the Creator and the creature. There can be no demi-god. He must have come personally from beyond the fathomless depth which in idea separates the one creature nature from the creatures. He must belong essentially to the one divine being. He must be of one substance with the Father.⁴

Just as Gore is insistent that Christ was God, so he insists that He was "truly and completely man".⁵ In respect of His manhood, Mary was His mother.⁶ "It was not that He appeared merely in human guise but that He really became man in the solidarity of human flesh and reality of human character."⁷

Further, Gore agrees with the decision of the Second Council whose verdict was "to affirm of Christ the nature of man in all its spiritual and ethical completeness and to repudiate

1 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, 22 f.
2 Ibid., p. 24.
3 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 82.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 325.
5 Loc. cit.
6 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 94.
7 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 87.
anything which denied this completeness”.1

Hence, Christ is fundamentally of two natures.2 Gore declares: "Jesus Christ is very God, of one substance with the Father";3 "He is perfectly Man, in the completeness of human faculties and sympathies".4 "Jesus Christ is of one substance with us men in respect of His manhood, as He is with the Father in respect of his Godhead."5 Hence, in Christ "two natures subsisted in one person".6 Christ was truly man as He was very God.7

Gore explains that the Incarnation is that of the eternal Son of God,8 who has "taken manhood up into Himself".9 He states that if Christ is "truly and completely man, that must be 'not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person,' by the taking of manhood into God".10 and: "In Christ our manhood

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 235.
2 Ibid., p. 240.
3 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 80.
4 Ibid., p. 81.
5 Loc. cit.
6 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 162.
7 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 93.
9 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 80.
10 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 325.
is taken into God."\(^1\) Hence, ostensibly at least, Gore holds the orthodox view of the Incarnation. The person of Christ consists of two natures—the one human, the other divine and, "Each nature retains its own properties without defect."\(^2\)

**Kenosis**

As has been indicated, in connection with his theory of inspiration, Gore holds to a very definite doctrine of *kenosis*, the essence of which is that the eternal Son limited Himself in becoming human.\(^3\) He maintains that the Christ recorded by the Gospel records lived and taught "under restrained human conditions".\(^4\) Christ existed under conditions "not natural to the Son of God and therefore ceased to exercise certain natural prerogatives of the divine existence".\(^5\) Hence, Christ hungered, was subjected to real temptations,\(^6\)

---

1 Gore, *New Theology and Old Religion*, p. 225. On the face of it, at least, these last three statements would seem to contradict Smides' judgment in his discussion of Gore's doctrine of the Incarnation wherein he states: "The conclusion would then be that the incarnation does not occur through 'the taking of manhood up into God' . . ." Lewis B. Smides, *The Incarnation: Trends in Modern Anglican Thought* (Amsterdam: J. H. Kok N.V. Kampen, 1953), p. 7.


6 Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 79.
and did not give indication of omniscience. 1 Gore asserts that though Christ was "an infallible no less than a sinless teacher", 2 he displayed practical limitations of knowledge. 3 Hence, Christ did not enlarge on natural knowledge, physical or historical, 4 he even admitted ignorance "saying plainly of that day and hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, except the Father only". 5

Christ's limitation is, according to Gore, a self-limiteration, the extent of which is "greater than we can fathom"; 6 in becoming man Christ did an act of "self-abnegation". 7 Using Dr. Westcott's words, Gore explains that Christ is exhibited as "laying aside the mode of divine existence' (To σε αυτή την άρση) in order to assume the human". 8 Again, Gore points out that "St. Paul describes the Incarnation as a "self-emptying", 9 a

1 Gore, The Incarnation, pp. 147 f.; Ibid., p. 159.
2 Cf. Gore, Lux Mundi, p. 264.
3 Ibid., p. 80.
4 Ibid., p. 81.
6 Ibid., pp. 111. Cf. Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 188; Gore, Christ and Society, p. 49.
7 Ibid., The Incarnation, p. 161.
8 Ibid., pp. 157 f.
9 Ibid., p. 89; Gore cites Westcott, Speaker's Commentary on St. John 1. 14.
"'self-beggary',\(^1\) an act by which the divine Son for our sakes 'became poor,' depriving Himself of the riches of His previous state.\(^2\)

Although he admits that St. Paul does not carry out the idea of kenosis in detail,\(^3\) Gore maintains that this self-limitation, self-beggary, or self-abandonment is not simply a humiliation but "a real self-impovery, a real self-emptying, a real self-limitation",\(^4\) "a real abandonment of divine prerogative and attributes".\(^5\) Hence, it is real \(k\varepsilon\varphi\omega\iota\).\(^6\)

Taking his cue from Philippians 2:6-7, Gore explains that the word, "form" (\(\mu\varphi\rho\theta\iota\)), means "the permanent characteristics of a thing".\(^7\) Hence, Christ gave up the permanent characteristics of God to take on the permanent characteristics of man.\(^8\)

What is told us of our Lord's intellectual growth in childhood, of His relation to the Holy Spirit as man both in teaching and working miracles, of His

---

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 158.
2 Ibid., p. 59. Cf. Gore, Can We Then Believe? Note 6, p. 193. Gore's Christology has an almost too great emphasis of Christ's subordination to the Father. He calls it "a sense of absolute subordination." Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 235.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? Note 7, p. 193.
4 Gore, Dissertations, p. 204.
5 Ibid., p. 206.
6 Ibid., p. 105.
7 Gore, Dissertations, p. 89; Gore, The Incarnation, p. 157.
8 Gore, Dissertations, p. 89.
progressive 'learning' from the Father, of His asking questions and expressing surprise, of His ignorance of the day and hour of the end, of His prayers, of His dismay and agony, of His feeling Himself ' forsaken' by the Father: all that St. Paul and St. John tell us, to account for these facts, about His having 'come down' from heaven and left 'the glory,' and after His resurrection returning whence He had come—of His 'emptying Himself,' 'beggaring Himself' to take the real characteristics of humanity, and of His being in that humanity, subsequently exalted: all this (and there is nothing which disagrees with it) forces upon us a consistent pressure of evidence, the conclusion that a real self-emptying was involved in the Incarnation.¹

However, Gore is not quite consistent. While on the one hand he insists that "the divine Son during the period of His mortal life so fully accepted the limitations of humanity as to act under the conditions of human willing and knowing,"² on the other he states: "I need to guard myself against ascribing to our Lord during 'the days of His flesh' a merely human consciousness,"³ and: "He did not so appear as to admit of His being thought of in merely human terms."⁴ Therefore, it would seem though Gore admits that Christ had more than a human consciousness, he insists that He was subject to human limitations.⁵ Hence, Gore really contradicts his own theory of

¹ Gore, Dissertations, p. 203.
² Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 242.
³ Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 195.
⁴ Loc. cit.
⁵ Loc. cit.
Kenosis. This contradiction arises directly from Gore's attempt to explain how it was possible for Christ to be man and still remain true to the New Testament evidence. The explanation is necessary for Gore because of his concepts of personal Idealism which must take into account the personality of Christ. However, in that kenosis is an attempt to explicate the ways

1 Gore runs into a certain difficulty when he considers Christ's self-limitation in its relation to His operation in the universe. He maintains, however, that there is not evidence in the New Testament to affirm an "absolute kenosis" (Gore, dissertations, pp. 91 ff.) therefore, he feels that Christ's self-emptying is compatible with His cosmic function, (Ibid., pp. 92, 105) and that he did not actually cease to mediate the procession of the Holy Ghost in the divine being or to uphold the world in being. Ibid., p. 206. However, to explain his view, Gore must posit a double centre of consciousness. He states that "He who knows all and does all things in the Father and in the universe should (reverently, be it said) have begun to live from a new centre when He assumed manhood, and under new and restricted conditions of power and knowledge." Ibid., p. 215. Here Gore finds himself in agreement with the Danish Bishop Martensen (Ibid., p. 215. Cf. Ibid., p. 192) whose position Gore maintains accounts for all the Scriptural language and is reconcilable with the authority of the decisions of the Church. Ibid., p. 193; Gore cites Martensen, Christian Dogmatics. Clarks Foreign Theology Library, pp. 266-67. However, Gore admits that this position is a bit difficult to conceive, (Loc. cit.) but he excuses it on the grounds of human incapabilities saying "many things that are facts are beyond the power of human conception". Ibid., p. 216. If carried out to its logical conclusions, Gore's theory would involve extreme complications. Not only would it involve the double centre of consciousness which Gore posits, that is, one before the incarnation and one during it, but in that he does not ascribe to "absolute kenosis" such as the theory of Godet, (Ibid., pp. 191 ff.) it would necessitate a third more or less "continuing logos" centre of consciousness, which is active on the human during the Incarnation, as well as the partially active divine conscience which Gore asserts was active in Christ's humanity. However, Gore gives no indication of an inclination to extend his theory to this degree. Nevertheless he
of God in human categories and from man's point of view, running beyond the Biblical evidence, it is to be expected that it will be controverted by the Biblical revelation. Gore's doctrine of kenosis which really stems from Idealism is integral to his doctrine of the Church as the extension of the Incarnation. Both, though they incorporate Biblical terminology, rest on his idealistic philosophy.

does assert that Christ's act of kenosis was not the first but the second of God's acts of self-limitation. The first was the limitation of His omnipotence in the creation of free beings. Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 19. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 238.

By his doctrine of kenosis, Gore wishes to rid theology of the docetism which he felt was present in a view such as Liddon's. Liddon maintains that Christ's knowledge was practically equivalent to omniscience. Cf. Ibid.; p. 155; H. P. Liddon, The Divinity of Our Lord (Sixteenth Edition; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892), pp. 461 ff. Gore maintains that, as an reaction to Arianism, anti-Arian theology had a tendency to withdraw the admission of Christ's ignorance, (Gore, Dissertations, p. 130) but he excuses the defective-ness of the theology of the Fathers and Schoolmen on the subject because of both the lack of actual exegesis and the fact that their philosophical categories as applied to God were abstract and a priori. Ibid., p. 213.

Though Gore admits that the bulk of theological writing is against an acceptance of kenosis, (Ibid., p. 202) he maintains that mostly Anglican divines have assumed it, (Ibid., p. 198) and that it should be placed at the forefront of catholic theology. Ibid., p. 206.


1 J. K. S. Reid has pointed out that the danger of kenosis is that "the real paradox of the God-man is really done away, and we have merely the miracle of divinity becoming man and in the act ceasing to be divinity; and then we talk as if the conciliar agreements of Chalcedon had never been reached". J. K. S. Reid, The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1955), p. 4.
Gore maintains that the basic principle behind the Incarnation is that the spiritual expresses itself through the material. However, this is not only the principle behind the Incarnation, but, for Gore, it is the principle behind the whole of reality. It must be remembered that, according to Gore, Christ is not unique in the revelatory process in the sense that He alone reveals God. Far from it: not only has God revealed Himself in other than the Christian or Jewish religions, but the whole creative process of nature, as Gore explains it, must be seen as "God's revelation". Hence, God is said to reveal Himself via natural processes as well as via direct revelation. In fact nature and revelation are, for Gore, of a piece. Therefore, Christ can be understood either as the end product of the direct revelatory or of the emergent evolutionary process.

Looking at Gore's concept of personality we see, as we have said, that personality is a matter of achievement, of "self-realization", "the development of faculties".

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 219.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 63.
3 Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 163 f.
4 Cf. Ibid., ante pp. 161 f., 164 f.
5 Cf. Ibid., ante pp. 164 ff.
6 Cf. Ibid., ante pp. 160 ff.
7 Cf. Ibid., ante p. 190.
states that Christ's consciousness of divine sonship co-existed with "a really human development of life."¹ Christ is the ideal personality.² In order to have achieved personality, it was necessary for Christ to have begun as something less. As perfect God, therefore, He necessarily had to give up His divine prerogatives—hence Kenosis. Thus Gore holds that in the Incarnation God "abandoned whatever was inconsistent with really human experience".³

... our Lord is to exhibit a true example of manhood—tried, progressive, perfected. For this purpose it was necessary that He should be without the exercise of such divine prerogatives as would have made human experience or progress impossible.⁴

Christ developed personality to its fulness. He is man in all "ethical completeness".⁵ He is the climax of creation as well as redemption.⁶ Hence, He is not called supernatural as such, but from the point of view of mere man, He is supernatural.⁷ For Gore, then, Kenosis is necessary to explain Christ's relation to personality, but also to explain Christ's

---

¹ Gore, Dissertations, p. 79. Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 189 f.
² Cf. Chp. IV, ante p. 189.
³ Gore, Can We Then Believe? Note 7, p. 194.
⁵ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 235.
⁶ Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 176.
relation to man in general and, more important, man's relation to Christ. Christ achieved His personality beginning where man in general begins, and hence, man in general should achieve a personality which is on the same level with that of Christ's. The divine spirit manifests itself in the same way in both.

Gore asserts that the human self is "a divine reality", that human flesh is holy. He states: "If we get down to any fundamental law of nature or of human action, whether in bad men or good men, we get to something which is also divine."

As we explained in the discussion of Gore's philosophical concepts, Gore refuses to differentiate between the natural and the supernatural, he has but one ontological substance. Therefore, in that he admits of a divinity, he is necessarily forced to the conclusion that man is in some sense divine, and although he nowhere makes the statement as such, his entire thought and especially that concerned with his doctrines of kenosis and the Church as the extension of the Incarnation clearly imply that Christ and man are ontologically one. Here it would seem that he simply does not take cognizance of his Biblically accurate assertions as to the differentiation be-

---


2 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 59.

3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 182.

4 Cf. Chp. IV, ante p. 166.
tween Creator and creature and the identity of Christ and God.

Hence, the Incarnation is, for Gore, unique only in the degree of its fulness. In all creation the divine mind has revealed itself; in Christ it has revealed itself fully.¹ All men are the image of God;² Christ is God's "very image".³ The sameness with a distinction of degree is seen in Gore's concepts of morality: all men are moral in that man is morally like God;⁴ Christ is the embodiment of the "moral ideal";⁵ and in his concepts of personal Idealism: "The human personality is an inadequate image of the divine personality".⁶ Christ realizes personality "in its depth, its fulness".⁷ All men are potentially sons of God;⁸ Christ is the Son of God.⁹

¹ Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 164 ff.
³ Ibid., p. 173.
⁴ Ibid., p. 116.
⁵ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 317.
⁶ Gore, Belief in God, p. 113.
⁷ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 118. The achievement of personality is described by Gore as "self-realization", and is explained as a moral advance, a process which is equated with the salvation of the soul. The locus of this process is, for Gore, society and in the case of the Christian, the society is the Church. Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 169 ff.
For Gore, the Incarnation is extended in the Church because it is a part of each of the personalities of its members. Christ dwells in the community and in its individual members. Christ is immanent in man, moulding him into His likeness. "It is the inward presence of Jesus Christ ... that makes His example for the sons of faith, practical and realizable." Again, let it be stressed that this is not the dwelling of Christ in the heart by faith as the Apostle Paul expresses it, but the Church is Christ's body, "the great 'Christbears'," 5 "great Christopher' perpetuating, in a new, but not less real way, the presence of the Son of man in the world", because "it embodies the same principle as 'the Word made flesh'". 7 "The same principle unites Christ to God and the church to Christ"; as "Christ is the embodiment of God ... so the visible church is the embodiment of Christ". 9 For Gore, the true human life, i.e. that of Christ, is ful-

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 74.
2 Gore, Body of Christ, pp. 30 f.
3 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 146.
7 Ibid., p. 219.
8 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 174.
9 Ibid., p. 173.
filled with all the completeness of the divine life, and
"that true human life is shared by each and every member of
His Church, without reference to race or learning, or wealth,
or sex, or age."  The Church extends the Incarnation because
its members extend it.

This is not to indicate that Gore holds that the Pentecost was of no effect, for Christ's Spirit was, he maintains,
poured out on those gathered, but the action of the Spirit
is, for Gore, always supplementary to that which is natural to
man. When it is understood that man is essentially of one
substance with Christ, then it is not difficult to understand
how it is possible for the Church through its members to be
the extension of the Incarnation. The Spirit, as has been in-

1 Gore, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 57.

of the Good Life*, pp. 195 ff.

3 Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 154 ff. For Gore, nature is not
interpreted, but complemented by the Incarnation. Gore, *Di-
sertations*, p. 92. "The supernatural leads up and elevates

4 It is true, of course, as has been indicated, that Gore
maintains that the Creator is absolutely distinct from His crea-
tures, (Cf. Chp. IV, ante p. 193) and that Christ is of one
substance with the Father, (Cf. ante pp. 214 ff.) which state-
ments would seem to controvert the above argument, but Gore's
refusal to make any differentiation in his thought between
natural and supernatural rids his assertions as to distinc-
tion between Creator and creature and as to identification
between Christ and God of any ontological meaning. Cf. Chp.
IV, ante pp. 160 ff., 164 ff.
dicated, is, according to Gore, not other than Christ Himself,¹ and the Spirit, "is freely given to all members of the body".² Hence, Gore states: "The Incarnation did not end in Christ our head: it passed on to the incorporation of us His members."³ Not that the Church or its members are yet divine, for Gore attributes the divine fulness of the Godhead to the Church "ideally".⁴

This identification of Christ with the Church ... is not yet fully realized. The Church is not yet glorified, not yet morally perfected nor full grown in the divine attributes ... ⁵

Hence, Gore maintains that the Church is ideally divine, in a process of so becoming.

However, "the Church as well as Christ shall embody and thus be identified with, the fulness of the divine attributes".⁶ Thus, Gore states: "What had been summarily realized in Christ is progressively realized in those who are 'in Him'",⁷ and he adds: "We are all to be anointed by the same Spirit which pos-

¹ Cf. ante p. 214.
² Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 30. "Body" is here used in the sense of the communal body of the Church.
³ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 220.
⁴ Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 57. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 36.
⁵ Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 57.
⁶ Ibid., p. 81.
⁷ Ibid., p. 99.
sessed Him—we are all (if you will) to be Christ. ¹ "There is truly to be an Incarnation of God in humanity", ² for the Church "is the manifestation of God in a definite visible form". ³

Hence, the Church is the body of Christ because it contains within itself, as do its members, the Spirit of Christ, which is His body. The Church is the society which Christ founded while on earth, a fellowship patterned after the old Israel which was endowed at Pentecost with His Spirit, i.e. His body, the operation of which is defined in moralistic terms, the purpose of which is to form, in the New Humanity, an Incarnation of God. "The Church exists to perpetuate in every age the life of Jesus, the union of manhood with Godhead." ⁴ Therefore, Gore's extension of the Incarnation becomes what can only be named a "re-incarnation", incorporating

---

¹ Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 162. "Christ's" here is plural. Oddly enough, Gore expresses the Christology of the "new" theology which he refutes in almost exactly these words, which he here avows as his own. Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, pp. 84 ff. He adds the very interesting phrase: "It is plain that such an idea of the incarnation as is here presented, while it has in it much that is very close to the biblical idea, is at the root fundamentally different." Ibid., p. 86. Again, Gore speaks of the uniqueness of Christ's Sonship, (Gore, The Incarnation, p. 131) and that "there cannot be more than one Incarnate Son of God." Ibid., p. 219.

² Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 182.

³ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 174. Gore adds: "It is exactly this principle as applied to the Church which Protestantism seems to me to reject." Loc. cit.

⁴ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 219.
the same principle as the first, that of God joining Himself to humanity, but differing from it in that it is achieved corporately in place of individually.¹

Here again, in his concept of the being of the Church, Gore's bi-polar type of thought is evident. When he defines the Church as a visible society founded on the basis of the Old Israel, in his discussion of the Church in relation to the Kingdom, and even in naming it the "Body of Christ", there is little doubt that he remains true to his Scriptural evidence. However, when he inquires into the relations between Christ and man—his doctrine of "Kenosis", and between Christ and the Church—his doctrine of "The Extension of the Incarnation", he becomes speculative and his idealistic concepts steer his thought.²

¹ Cf. Torrance, op. cit., p. 31, where he warns against "a re-incarnation of the Risen Lord".

CHAPTER VI

THE FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH

When commenting on the central idea maintained by the Anglo-Catholic Movement, Gore writes:

Jesus Christ, our Lord, had in one sense accomplished at His Ascension in His single person the redemption of man. But in another sense... He had only provided in full measure the means for its accomplishment, leaving behind Him for the fulfilment of His purpose the Church.¹

Gore contends that "Christ... combined and fulfilled in his single person the functions of prophet and priest and king",² and further that "as His Father hath sent Him on this prophetic, priestly, kingly mission, so in His turn in the persons of His apostles He sends out His Church".³ Thus: "The things that Jesus began both to do and to teach, 'he was to go on doing and teaching through his Spirit in the Church which is his body, the organ of his perpetual action."⁴ Therefore, Gore holds: "The Church perpetuates the mission of her Master—prophetic, priestly, kingly."⁵ In fact, the mission of the Church "is the carry-

⁵ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 6.
ing out, in its full scope, of the mission of the Christ".¹ So, as the words, "prophet", "priest", and "king" sum up Christ's activities for man's redemption,² they sum up the activity or function of the Church.³ Gore writes of the Church:

The Church as Prophet

The Church is prophetic, according to Gore, in bearing witness to the truth involved in the person of Jesus.⁵ Christ is an "infallible" no less than a "sinless" teacher.⁶ He "teaches with authority and with a note of infallibility".⁷ Further, Gore asserts that "the Church goes out on its great

¹ Ibid., p. 3.
² Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 19 f.
³ Here again Gore's concept of the Church being the extension of the Incarnation has import. It is the extension not only in its being but also in its function.
⁴ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 153.
⁵ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 6.
function, conceiving this to be its business, to carry down through the ages this message of God.  

"It is the commissioned carrier of the message." Thus Gore maintains:

... the Christian church is regarded as essentially prophetic, not in the sense of being the channel of new 'words of God', but in the sense of being entrusted with a word of God already communicated ...

According to Gore, Christ taught men of the character of God because God disclosed Himself in Him.

We look to the human mind and will and character, the human justice and love, of Jesus of Nazareth, and we know that we behold nothing else than the mind and will and character, the justice and love, of very God.

Moreover, God disclosed Himself fully in Christ.

No disclosure of God to man, such as is possible in this world, can be even conceived fuller or completer than is given in Him who is God incarnate—the Word made flesh. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father.

However, for Gore, Christ was primarily a moral teacher; He was the last great moral teacher. Gore asserts that "there

---


2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 162.

3 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 62.

4 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 4.


can be no question that in the main His teaching was moral.\textsuperscript{1} He set out "moral instruction",\textsuperscript{2} and enunciated intelligible moral principles.\textsuperscript{3} Further, Gore declares that the bulk of the New Testament and the teaching of the Epistles in particular is ethical teaching.\textsuperscript{4}

However, it must here again be recorded that Gore maintains that the content of Christ's ethical teaching is not unique.\textsuperscript{5} "His message was rooted in the ancient bed of prophetic teaching",\textsuperscript{6} which teaching was "ethical through and through".\textsuperscript{7} Likewise, Gore points out that ethical teaching was common to religions of the non-Judaeo-Christian tradition as well as to the ancient philosophers.\textsuperscript{8} Nevertheless, Christ supplied what neither the prophets nor the philosophers could supply, "the embodiment of the moral ideal".\textsuperscript{9} Consequently,

\textsuperscript{1} Gore, \textit{Holy Spirit and the Church}, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{2} Gore, \textit{Philosophy of the Good Life}, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 317.
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 180 ff.
\textsuperscript{7} Gore, \textit{Philosophy of the Good Life}, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{8} Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 180 ff.
Christ not only enunciated intelligible moral principles, but He set a perfect example.\(^1\) He appealed to men "primarily or chiefly as an example they could follow".\(^2\)

Therefore, though Gore declares that the moral consciousness is most highly developed in the religion of the prophets and in the religion of Christ,\(^3\) he asserts that Christianity is "the supreme expression of ethical monotheism".\(^4\) Consequently he contends that because Christ taught primarily "a way of life",\(^5\) or "a manner of life"\(^6\) the earliest name for the Church was "The Way".\(^7\) Following from this Gore asserts that "Christianity must be identified with a positive and exacting moral standard",\(^8\) and he avows that "our greatest intellectual or literary deed is a comprehensive work on Christian Ethics".\(^9\)

---

1 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 317.
2 Gore, Belief in Christ, pp. 174 f.
3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 271.
4 Ibid., p. 318.
5 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 91. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 158.
9 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 165.
Gore is too much of a theologian, however, not to realize that the prophetic task of the Church involves more than the provision of a moral standard. Though he asserts that "Christianity is a life before it is a doctrine", he also points out that "life cannot really be dissociated from doctrines", declaring that "in the long run what any society is to become will depend on what it believes, or disbelieves, about eternal things".

... in the long reaches of human society we find the different dogmatic beliefs building quite different social structures—Buddhist, Hindu, Mohammedan, Christian; and there is no reason in supposing that Christian morality or the Christian hope would permanently survive the Christian doctrine.

For this reason Christianity "involves a theology"; "the Christian 'way' depends for its motives and supports upon a specific doctrine about God and His love, and His purposes for man". Hence: "A creed ... is at the basis of the Christian


3 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 250.


5 Gore, Christianity Applied to Men and Nations, p. 50.

Gore explains that Christian dogmas "are simply statements of those truths which are the necessary background or basis of the Christian life", and that, therefore, though Christianity witnesses to a definite moral ideal, it also witnesses to "definite theological positions."

For Gore, the theological position of the Church is summed up in the creeds. He first refers to the creeds as having positive substance saying that "in the earliest church subjective faith involved a certain objective and public creed which came very soon to be called 'the faith'." The essence of this early creed was the profession that "'Jesus is Lord'." How-

---

3 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 215. Gore emphasizes the fact that the strength of those who call themselves catholics has lain in the definiteness of their principles. "They have known definitely what they believed." Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 225. This he believes to be the ground of "the wonderful progress of what is called the Catholic movement--the Tractarian movement". Loc. cit.
4 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 81.
5 Charles Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (London: John Murray, 1899-1900), II, 55.
6 Loc. cit. Writing of the earliest Christian confessions of faith, Oscar Cullmann states in reference to the simplest of them: "Dieses einfache Bekenntnis drückt sich zunächst in kurzen Formeln aus: 'Kyrios Jesus Christos' (1. Kor. 12, 3), 'Jesus ist der Christus' (1. Joh. 2, 22), 'Jesus ist der Sohn Gottes' (Apg. 8, 37, westlicher Text; 1. John, 4, 15; Hebr. 4, 14), 'Jesus ist ins Fleisch gekommen' (1. Joh. 4, 2). Mit Recht hat
ever Gore adds that the theology of the apostolic Church involved "a theology of Father, Son, and Spirit, and of the Incarnation of the Son."¹ This theology, Gore maintains, is implied from the first in both the Epistles and in the records of the Gospels.² It is a theology that is centred in the person of Christ.

St. John calls the Word who is Christ Jesus, God with God, God only-begotten ... St. Paul speaks of Him as 'pre-existing in the form, or characteristics, of God,' and as 'God over all.' The author of the epistle to the Hebrews calls Him the 'very image, or counterpart, of God's substance.' The apostolic writers generally identify Him, as Lord, with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. . . .

Again, the Evangelists, including St. John, and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, dwell much on the complete humanity of the Son of man: on the action of the human will in obedience, of the human spirit in prayer, of the human mind even in limitation of knowledge. St. Paul describes Him as taking the characteristics, or form, of man's servile nature. St. Peter speaks of His human spirit, side by side with His human body.³

However, in contrast to the positive apostolic statements as to the person of Christ are the negative dogmatic de-

---

¹ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 83.
³ Ibid., p. 98.
crees of the councils. 

"The dogmatic decisions of councils are formulas rendered necessary for no other purpose than to guard the faith of Scripture from what was calculated to undermine it." 

Gore asserts that the creeds are simply summaries of the original Christian faith as it is represented in Scripture, the best and most authoritative of which is given in "the great catholic creeds, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds." 

Gore writes:

The Creed asserts four propositions: (1) that, as Son of God, Jesus Christ is very God, of one substance with the Father; (2) that, as Son of Man, He is perfect man, complete in human faculties and sympathies; (3) that, though both God and man, He is yet one person—viz., the Son of God who has taken manhood into Himself; (4) that the manhood still remains truly human, so that Jesus Christ is, in His manhood, of one substance with us, as, in His Godhead, He is one with the Father.

Hence, he declares that "the Creed of the Church has been substantially the same ... since the days of St. Paul.

Attesting to the value of the creeds, Gore asserts:

1 Ibid., p. 106.
2 Ibid., p. 81.
3 Loc. cit.
6 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 87.
"There is in those creeds the whole mind of Christendom".⁠¹ He calls them "the classical expression of the catholic religion, having supreme authority among Christian statements of our faith".⁠² He maintains: "The notes of the catholic creed still ring on, for the Christian dogmas claim the same permanence as the Christian Church."⁠³ He is certain that divine providence has been guarding the Church in the formal declarations of her faith as can really be called Catholic, "which have really been believed and taught in the Church semper, ubique, ab omnibus".⁠⁴ He affirms, "I at least believe that in the Catholic Creed and the great ecumenical decisions you have truly the results of the guidance of the Divine Spirit faithfully embodied in human words".⁠⁵ Consequently, for Gore, the creeds represent a wide and permanent asset of the Church, "they offer an unchanging basis of definite religious instruction, and a form of religious confession which unites us... with a great catholic communion of many ages and many nations".⁠⁶

---

¹ Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 40.
² Loc. cit.
³ Gore, The Incarnation, p. 102.
⁴ Gore, Dissertations, p. 67.
⁵ Gore, Dominant Ideas, pp. 103 f. However, Gore detracts from this theocentric type of thought when he indicates that the basis for the permanence of the creed is "unchanging manhood". Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 142 f.
Accordingly, Gore affirms that "on the doctrine of Christ's person the historical Christian Church has committed itself beyond recall", and that if the Church is to retain credit as the teacher of divine revelation, it cannot exhibit any wavering or uncertainty on the central points which the Nicene Creed contains. "By these articles of our faith, Christianity certainly as a revealed religion, stands or falls." 

p. 6. Gore writes: "Since the Reformation differences have sundered the visible Christian society into fragments: emphasis has been laid on one point in this body and on another in that; but Calvinist and Lutheran, Anglican, Romanist, Greek, and Russian have confessed the same faith in the Holy Trinity, one God; in Christ, perfect God and perfect Man; in his birth of a Virgin and life and death for man, and His Resurrection and Ascension; in the descent of the Spirit, and the formation of the Church: the fellowship of the saints: the forgiveness of sins: in judgment to come and everlasting life." Charles Gore, The Permanent Creed and the Christian Idea of Sin (London: John Murray, 1905), p. 9.

1 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 25.


3 Loc. cit. It is of interest to note that, because Gore maintains that due to the fact that the first preaching of the Apostles was limited to their own experience, the resurrection holds chief place among the grounds of faith in Jesus and no appeal is made to the miracle of His birth; therefore, Gore asserts that "we are probably right in drawing the conclusion that it never ought to be made part of the grounds on which faith is claimed". Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 247.

Gore is insistent that the creeds have relevance to all history. Cf. Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 142 ff. He asserts that the Christianity of the creeds is not "bound up with any special mode of conceiving the structure of the universe". Ibid., p. 61. He indicates that some of the language of the creed is necessarily symbolical in that it "expresses in vivid pictures what transcends present human faculty", (Ibid., p. 62. Cf. Gore, Belief in God, p. 180) and that modes of language do not necessarily concur with scientific discovery and that even
Much as Gore respects the creeds or dogmas of the Church, he is ambiguous in his discussion of them. He sometimes speaks of dogma and creed as referring to the belief of the apostolic Church or the requirements of Christian belief as expressed in the New Testament. At other times he uses the terms in reference to the conciliar decisions, and at still other times, today knowing the discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo, we still "speak of the motions of the sun and moon, not as we scientifically know them to be, but as they appear relatively to our vision—because, as seen by us, the sun and moon still rise and set". Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 62. Further, he avers that in expressing moral ideas, we still use physical metaphors. "We talk of 'loftier' and 'baser' men, of a 'higher' world and a 'lower' world, of 'upward' and 'downward' tendencies in civilization, with the same inevitable picturesque-ness as when we held the 'three-storied' view of the universe for true." Ibid., p. 63. Cf. Charles Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds (Second Edition; London: Rivingtons, 1887), p. 11.

Hence, thirty years ago, Gore makes conclusions that would certainly be applicable in the Bultmann "de-mythologizing" [Entmythologisierung] controversy. Also, Gore is correct in insisting that "what the Church borrowed from Greek thought was her terminology, not the substance of her creed". Gore, The Incarnation, p. 101. Thus, too, it would seem Gore successfully controverts Sanday's criticism that he does not take into consideration that the creeds were composed fifteen to seventeen centuries ago, and therefore, cannot "express with literal exactitude the mind of today". W. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914), p. 8. Again, Gore's allowing the creeds to express truth to the modern mind and maintaining that their expression of truth is not dependent either on a particular mood of conceiving the structure of the universe or with any particular Greek metaphysics is the real difference between his and Rashdall's interpretation of Christian theology. This difference is the basis for Rashdall's critical articles entitled, "Some Plain Words to Bishop Gore", The Modern Churchman XI (Jan., 1922), XII (April, 1922), XII (July, 1922).

1 Cf. ante pp. 238 f.
2 Cf. ante p. 240.
he uses the terms to include both the apostolic requirements and the conciliar decisions.¹ In the first instance, this ambiguity would seem to make little real difference since Gore is convinced that the conciliar decisions accurately reflect the apostolic requirements, and hence, what is necessary dogma at one time is necessary at all times (semper, ubique, ab omnibus). However, when discussing the place and function of dogma and creed, the effect of the ambiguity becomes apparent. To Gore, the apostolic requirement or faith is positive, primary, and, hence, the source of Christian teaching, while the conciliar decisions are negative in nature, necessary for the protection of the apostolic message. Therefore, the ambiguity becomes a source of confusion.

Most generally Gore speaks of dogma as conciliar decision, and though occasionally he credits it with being the basis of religious instruction,² thus seeming to endow it with positive content, as he does in the statement: "A Church should subsist on a very limited amount of positive³ dogmatic requirements,"⁴ his usual position is that the dogmas of the early Church were "negative rather than positive."⁵ "They are intended to say

---

¹ Cf. ante pp. 241 f.
³ Italics not in original.
⁴ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 53.
'no' rather than 'yes', to deny rather than to teach.\(^1\) They are "limitations"\(^2\) necessary to "guard the faith''.\(^3\) Gore maintains that in the early Church dogmas were considered "necessary evils'\(^4\), and asserts that "the smaller the requirements to be carried over from one epoch to another and one race to another, the better''.\(^5\) Thus, he assents to Erasmus's proposition: "Let the essentials of the faith be limited to the fewest articles possible'\(^6\).

As opposed to the medieval and scholastic method of regarding dogmas as positive premises of thought from which the truth of Christ's person is logically and deductively conceived,\(^7\) Gore insists that they are to be regarded as "the hedge rather

---

\(^1\) Gore, The Incarnation, p. 106. Cf. Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 216; Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 188.


\(^3\) Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 164.


\(^6\) Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 224; Gore refers to Erasmus the Reformer by Mr. Elliott Binns (Methuen, 1923).

\(^7\) Gore, Dissertations, p. 171. Gore asserts that Roman Catholicism is a "one-sided development of Christianity", (Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 33) having "committed itself to unhistorical doctrines". Ibid., p. 34. Cf. Gore, The Athanasiand Creed, p. 8.
than the pasture-ground: they block us off from lines of error rather than edify us in the truth. "1 Dogmas are not "a substitute for truth, but a guide to its apprehension."2 "They were not meant to give us a positive knowledge of Christ or to override the gospel picture."3 Gore asserts that "for our positive picture of Christ we must constantly go back to the Gospels".4 In sum he states:

The dogmas are only limits, negatives which block false lines of development, notice-boards which warn us off false approaches, guiding us down the true road to the figure in the Gospels, and leaving us to contemplate it unimpeded and with the frankest gaze.5

If the creeds of the Church are negative, of use only as safeguards to the pronouncements of Scripture, how is it that Gore continually sets the Church over Scripture in the matter of teaching illustrated by his statement, "The Church is to teach, the Bible to prove"?6 Here again we enter the problem of the relation between Scripture and tradition which has been somewhat discussed in the elucidation of Gore's Biblical-criti-

---

2 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 73.
3 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 39.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 290.
5 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 108.
6 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 54; Gore, The Incarnation, p. 81.
cal thought.\textsuperscript{1}

Gore's purposes are obvious. The first is that of reserving for the Church as high a position as possible while still taking cognizance of the Scriptures, thus ruling out the doctrine of the self-sufficiency of Scripture,\textsuperscript{2} and at the same time not allowing his doctrine to slip over into the Roman position. He insists that it is "by this appeal to Scripture that Anglicanism stands or falls in its controversy with Rome",\textsuperscript{3} that "the formal appeal of the Anglican divines has always been to the \textit{quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus}, as well as Scripture",\textsuperscript{4} and that the Church of England glories "in an open Bible and the appeal to history".\textsuperscript{5}

The second reason for Gore's exaltation of the Church, an exaltation which tends to abase the Scriptures is the protection of his doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

The same society, for the purposes of its spiritual work, at the same date formulates its creed, proclaims its succession of bishops, and begins to draw up its canon of sacred books. You can very rightly exalt the canon of Scripture, as the church did, as giving the original and authentic form of the apos-

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. G\textsc{hp.} III, ante pp. 131 ff.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. \textit{Loc. cit.}


\textsuperscript{5} Gore, \textit{Dominant Ideas}, p. 84.
tolic preaching; and you can make it the basis and standard of doctrine. But you cannot reasonably isolate the New Testament from the creed or the episcopal successions, and assert the authority of the one, while you repudiate that of the others; or in particular assert the authority of the first the while you repudiate that of the third.¹

In emphasizing the position of the Church, Gore insists that the books of the New Testament cannot stand alone, that they are products of the Church, written for those who had already been taught the rudiments of religion by the Church. From here he wanders on dangerous ground, asserting that "the documents which are included in the canon are separated by no gulf from those just outside it".²

However, as has been mentioned, when faced with either the New Theology or Roman Catholicism, Gore, at least formally, flees from this weak position in which he has placed the canon of Scripture maintaining that "there is nothing of importance, as doctrine, which can make a plausible claim to have been in the original tradition which is not also plainly implicit, at least, in the written books".³ Further, he avows that Scrip-

¹ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 192. Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession is extensively discussed in Part II, post pp. 338 ff.

² Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 191.

ture is "the perpetual criterion of teaching," and that the whole teaching of the Church is found in Scripture. Also, he approves of the requisites of the Church of England: that its ministers "are required to give special promise to teach out of the Scriptures, and to lay nothing on their hearers, as binding upon their faith, except what is contained in Scripture". Ostensibly, it would seem as if it should be possible to say, "That settles it, Gore holds the primacy of Scripture to the extent that what is not contained therein is not legitimate Christian teaching." Actually, however, though Gore insists that "in substance the revelation was once given and has never been augmented", that in the form of tradition it was deposited in the Church, was first passed on orally, and was later set in written form, and even that in our day there is no evidence worth considering that is not in the New Testament, he fails

2 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, pp. 63 f.
3 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, pp. 166 f.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 314.
5 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 190.
7 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 197.
to let the force of this truth shape his theology.

Again and again Gore refers to the fact that the Scriptures were written for those in the Church who were familiar with the tradition, and therefore, that the purpose of the New Testament was to check tradition, to verify it, to be a criterion, or to limit the Church's doctrinal authority. Hence, it was the Church that gave the primary instruction and the Scriptures tested the teaching.

From this evidence, Gore proposes that the roles of Church and Scripture are always basically the same: fulfilling identical functions in modern and in apostolic times. He states:

But let us remember that the New Testament was written for men who were Christians already. At first Christian teaching was not written: it was committed to the Christian group of societies as a tradition, as a rule of faith. ... But this tradition of the

---


2 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 55.

3 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 62.

4 Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, p. 55.

5 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 172; Gore, Dissertations, p. 205; Gore, Body of Christ, p. 224.

6 Cf. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 60.
society must be checked. This is done by the New Testament, which is the criterion of our teaching.

... The Church is ever to teach; the New Testament is ever to prove.¹

Here it is evident that Gore does not take cognizance of the fact that the situation has changed since apostolic times, i.e. that the oral tradition on which the Church based its teaching and out of which the Scriptures were born is now (as far as we know it) confined to the canon of Scripture.² Therefore, though the Church is still to teach and the Bible to prove, the Church can now only teach on the basis of the Bible. The Scriptures are not only criterion, they are source. The message of the Church which must be proved by the Scriptures must have its origin in them. The Church has no positive content except the Scriptures. Strangely enough, as has been indicated, Gore himself verifies this position in his discussion of the creeds, but he forgets it in his discussion of the teaching function of the Church and in his doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

¹ Gore, Why We Believe in Christ, pp. 54 f. Cf. Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 45.

² It is of interest to note that when Gore delineates the knowledge which was presupposed by the New Testament books, he lists the threefold name of the Trinity, the doctrine of the Incarnation, the facts of Jesus' human life: death, resurrection, and ascension, the expectation of Christ's second coming, and of the last things, the obligations of Church membership, and the meaning of the sacraments, (Gore, Doctrine of the Infallible Book, pp. 34 f.) all of which are common coin to the New Testament books.
The Church as Priest

As priest, Christ offered the propitiatory self-sacrifice for the redemption of His people.  
Hence, Christ's sacrificial death is, according to Gore, "the basis of a New Covenant".  
By His death He accomplishes man's atonement which reconciles man to God and frees the hand of God to give man all that He would give.

Moreover, Gore holds that from the first "the Christian Church had to apply and use Christ's priesthood and His reconciliation".  
It did this by admitting members by Baptism, by administering the gift of the Holy Spirit, by the laying on of hands, by excluding members and receiving them again after repentance, ("f'forgiving them in the person of Christ")  
and by celebrating the Eucharist which was regarded, according to Gore, as "the 'church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving".  
Hence, Gore holds that the Church as a whole is priestly.  
He calls the Church "a kingdom of priests", which

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 27.
2 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 112.
4 Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 161 f.
5 Ibid., p. 162.
7 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 86.
8 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 160.
makes use of the reconciliation of Christ.

However, for Gore, Christ's atoning sacrifice does not mean that man is perfectly reconciled to God, but rather that man "can claim the forgiveness of his sins in His [Christ's] name and can make a fresh start from a new standing-ground—in Christ".1 Gore asserts that Christ "has set at work a new development, which is the movement of the redeemed humanity".2 For this development Christ is the pattern.3 He is "the new manhood: a second Adam in diviner power to redress the balance of the first".4 Further: "What God predestined He accomplished first in summary 'in Jesus Christ';5 hence, "Men are to look for everything, for every kind of development and progress, in Christ".6 Moreover, Gore affirms that "it is the inward presence of Jesus Christ . . . that makes His example always, for the sons of faith, practical and realizable".7

---

1 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 26.
4 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 95.
5 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 98.
6 Ibid., p. 99.
... He, whose example we have before our eyes in the pages of the Gospels is working inwardly in our hearts, to purify us gradually and mould us into His own incomparable likeness.  

For Gore, however, this process of development, this following Christ's example has a definite moral connotation. Though he renders "justification" as "acceptance for membership in the sacred people, the Israel of God," and equates it with the forgiveness of sin, he also avows that "the first justification is a preliminary step which "may be promptly cancelled by our future conduct." Thus, though Gore recognizes that "the word 'regeneration' best describes, not a process, but a single divine act upon us and in us," he maintains that "it is only realized by our moral conversion."

Obedience, for Gore, is moral obedience. Therefore, in spite of the fact that formally he remains exegetically true in pointing out that, according to St. Paul, forgiveness of sins

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 146.  
3 Ibid., p. 27.  
5 Ibid., p. 27. Italics not in original.  
6 Ibid., pp. 267 f.  
7 Ibid., p. 268. Italics not in original. Cf. Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 38.  
8 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 92.
due to Christ's propitiation involves "no consideration of human merit",1 that the Galatians "were not made Christians because they had done anything to deserve it",2 and that faith is "the real root of the moral life",3 he criticizes Luther's conception of faith because "he [Luther] represented it as a bare acceptance of divine offer without any moral quality at all--a bare believing ourselves to be saved, without any moral reason in it".4 Moreover, Gore asserts: "It is faith only, and not works, however splendid, which justifies or enables God to make a man",5 and "the faith of St. Paul's conversion is what enabled God to accept him".6

Thus, what Gore takes away with his left hand, he restores with his right. Attempting to remain true to Scriptural evidence, he affirms that, according to the Apostle Paul, it is faith and not works that saves a man, but then by endowing faith with a moral quality and making its presence in man prior to God's ability to accept him, Gore returns faith to the area of man's accomplishment, hence, to the area of works. Following the same line, Gore asserts that while the doctrines of

1 Ibid., p. 135.
2 Ibid., p. 182.
3 Ibid., p. 169.
4 Ibid., p. 39.
5 Ibid., p. 170. Italics not in original.
6 Ibid., p. 40. Italics not in original.
atonesment and justification are essential to St. Paul's theology, they are not central. Rather, the heart of St. Paul's theology is the doctrine of Christ's life and spiritual and moral identification with Him. 1

As in fulfilling its prophetic office, the Church is to be an ethical teacher, so the fulfillment of its priestly office has a moral connotation. The Church is to grow in fullness, to embody the ethical ideal. Consequently, Gore writes:

Christianity went out into the world as a life to be lived, and that the life of a closely organic community, rather than as a theory or a theological creed to be believed. It ought always to present itself to the world primarily as the good life to be lived in human brotherhood. 2

He contends that it was the "moral quality of rock-like consistency" in the Twelve upon which Christ built His Church. 3 He proposes that the "expansive function of the Catholic Church was to fulfill, not primarily as a teacher of doctrine, but by the exhibition of a life", 4 and that "for centuries the predominant idea of the Church was still that of a society dedicated to a holy life of self-discipline and intimate fel-

1 Ibid., p. 220.

2 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 249 f.


4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 221.
fellowship".1

Thus, Christianity is first of all "a social life to be lived",2 a life which involves the maintaining "of her moral standard",3 and its main interest ought always to be "the following of 'the way,' the living of the life."4 Therefore, Gore avows that the great strength of the Christian Church is that "she is a great system of means to the moral end".5 He laments the fact that in the past the Church's appeal has been "not forward to some new standard of living, but 'back to Christ!'".6

Gore's strong prejudice for the moral aspects of Christianity leads him to assert: "Each man is accepted in the Beloved, only because he has come to share His Christ's character through the permeating influence of His Spirit."7 He


2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 347.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 314.


7 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 143.
maintains that "there is no fellowship with God possible except in likeness to God".\(^1\) He equates moral faithfulness with certainty of final personal acceptableness to God,\(^2\) and contends that "ultimately redemption can mean one thing only—the actual restoration of men into the moral likeness of God".\(^3\)

Following Aristotle according to whom man is a social animal who "realizes his individuality only by relations to a society",\(^4\) Gore asserts that it is because man is social that "the perfect man is to be realized, not by the single Christian, but by the whole Church".\(^5\) Therefore, in spite of the fact that he alleges that "there is no difference so fundamental as that between the creator and the creature",\(^6\) nevertheless he asserts that through Christ we all become "partners of the divine nature".\(^7\) "We are all to be anointed by the same Spirit which possessed Him—we are all (if you will) to be Christ's".\(^8\)

---

1 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 27.
3 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 201.
5 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 13.
7 Ibid.
8 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 182. This statement was also used in Chap. V, ante pp. 229 f.
As the Church must be reconciled to God, so it must be reconciled to itself, as it is necessary for the Church to grow in obedience so Gore propounds that it must grow in unity. As has been indicated in the preceding chapter, Gore maintains that the New Testament Church was essentially a unity. He asserts that the basic idea of the Christian fellowship is that of a family, and that "to St. Paul there was no Christianity without the reality of Catholic brotherhood." The Church is named "the brotherhood." For Gore, "She [the Church] is one because she alone of all societies of men possesses a supernatural indwelling presence and relation to God in Christ." Therefore, the primary point of the Church's union is "nothing lower than Christ." Elucidating further Gore states:

This is a unity which underlies all external separations of place or time, all external divisions and hostilities which result from the marring of the sacred gift by human sin. It is consistent with anything which does not break the channels down which the Church's essence is conveyed from the centre and

2 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 87.
3 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, 165.
4 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 41. Cf. Gore, The Incarnation, p. 211; Gore, Christ and Society, p. 54; Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 186.
5 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 27.
6 Ibid., p. 34.
source of life to all who share it.\textsuperscript{1}

Gore also points out that though the unity of the Church is primarily a unity of life, it is a unity in the truth as well. "It is a unity based on belief in a divine revelation, given in the person of Christ--based on the common confession that Jesus crucified and risen is Christ and Lord."\textsuperscript{2} Hence, "there is not only 'one body' but 'one faith'",\textsuperscript{3} and, "there is a 'tradition.'"\textsuperscript{4} Therefore, Gore maintains that one of the bonds of unity was "the authority of the common faith or word of God."\textsuperscript{5} Following from this he declares that there is no hope for unity among Christians which is really effective and deep without the apprehension of vital and necessary doctrines.\textsuperscript{6}

However, though Gore realizes that the visible Church is "imperfect in its unity",\textsuperscript{7} he also contends that because the Church possesses a basic unity "she ought to express it in outward fellowship".\textsuperscript{8} "It is incumbent upon us", he declares, "to

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 27.
\textsuperscript{2} Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{3} Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{4} Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{5} Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{6} Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 221 f.
\textsuperscript{7} Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{8} Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 28.
\end{flushleft}
avoid 'schism in the body'. He laments the fact that the "one holy catholic church has, as far as this world is concerned, fallen into divisions". He maintains that "schism is sin in Scripture", as well as in Ignatius and Cyprian.

Though Gore holds that the Apostolic Churches were "united by a common faith as well as by a common rule of life", he also avows that the old Christian idea was that of the body representing "unity in diversity". Hence, he maintains that in the early Church "'a very liberal temper of toleration' was to be found, and that there existed "markedly different schools of thought in the ancient and undivided catholic church". Therefore, he contends that the Church at all times should, as the early Church, find unity consistent with much

1 Loc. cit.
3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 54.
4 Ibid., p. 55. Gore alleges that it has been the arrogance and impatience of men that have brought about division. Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 37. Cf. Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 160.
5 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 83.
7 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 175.
variety in the types of theology and ceremonial.  

Nevertheless, in spite of the divisions that exist in the Church, Gore adjures that "we cannot be satisfied without real corporate union in one body".  

He insists, when speaking of the early Church that "love was enough to bind them together".  

Also, he declares that "when St. Paul speaks of the unity of the Church, he makes it depend—not on subordination of one external government, but—on the reception of one food, which is the Life of Christ".  

Hence, unity definitely does not depend on ecclesiastical and dogmatic authority, but "the Church is one because all baptized persons share a common life in Christ, and ought therefore to behave as "one body"".  

Though on the one hand Gore holds that "the very symbol

---

1 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 27. Like Augustine, Gore holds that unity is in a sense to be preferred to truth of opinion. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 135.  

2 Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 35. Though Gore would strive for Church unity, he maintains that the Roman Church has perverted the idea of Church unity "by a one-sided emphasis on unity of government". Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 153. Cf. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 135. Also he holds that "the Reformation was a time of reaction rather than settlement". Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 17. Cf. Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 35.  

3 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 84.  

4 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 27.  

5 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 163.  

6 Ibid., p. 154.
or institution of unity in one age may be the source of schism in another", on the other he maintains that unity must necessarily incorporate the four catholic institutions: the Creed or summary of the Christian faith, the canon of the sacred Scriptures, the sacraments, and a ministry consisting of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, perpetuated by the process of Apostolic Succession. Thus Gore has it that though the real unity of the Church is in Christ and "that the actual principle of unity in the Church is the Holy Spirit", there are necessarily external conditions of union also. He states:

... there cannot, I am convinced, be a reunited Church except on the basis of the Catholic Creeds, and the acknowledgement of the sacramental principle as well as the due administration of the sacraments, and the recognition of the episcopal succession as the link of connexion and continuity in the Catholic body.

However, it is apparent that the one factor of unity that is of ultimate import, for Gore, is that of Apostolic Succession. He asserts that as a catholic society the Church lacks the ordinary bonds of unity such as local contiguity, common language or common customs, and therefore, it will be difficult to con-

3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 353.
4 Ibid., p. 352.
ceive how its corporate continuity could have been maintained otherwise than through a succession of persons. 1 Again, he maintains that the infant Church had its unity in the apostles and later the ministry which derived from them by a process of Apostolic Succession was the centre of unity. Hence, he claims, "Rally round your officers!" was the cry alike of Ignatius, of Clement, and of their successors. 2

However dogmatic Gore is about catholicity, he is too tolerant to limit the activity of the Spirit to those communions which he considers to be catholic. 3 He states: "The Spirit, like the wind which represents Him, 'bloweth where it listeth'". 4 And catholic though Gore is, he asserts: "We must recognize much more frankly than we have done in the past how freely the Holy Spirit has worked for redemption outside the channels and methods of catholic Christendom". 5 Again, "It were blasphemy, then, to deny the Spirit's action where we see the Spirit's fruits." 6

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 10.
2 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 145.
3 I. e., those that incorporate Apostolic Succession.
5 Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 35.
6 Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 26 f. One of the modifications of the original spirit of the Tractarian movement is "the frank and full recognition that, while the New Testament will not suffer us to draw any distinction between the public
In contrast to the Protestant churches of the Continent and Scotland, Gore maintains that the Anglican Church in its reformation "carefully maintained the properly catholic tradition in structure and doctrine of the undivided church". Consequently he feels it has "a unique opportunity and responsibility in the present Christian world". He asserts that the Anglican Church like the early Church embraces people of very different opinions, and in God's providence "preserved the whole of the ancient catholic structure, both creed and Bible, sacraments and order... with a repudiation of the supreme authority of the Pope, and a whole-hearted acceptance of the principle of the doctrinal supremacy of Scripture". Thus, he declares that the Church of England maintains the principle of the Via Media.

and covenanted membership of Christ and obedient membership of the church which is His body, at the same time the final judgment of individuals is not given to the church as one of its functions, and we ought to feel quite sure that the just Judge will repudiate no one, nor refuse to welcome him into His eternal kingdom, who has faithfully sought to be true to the Light which lighteth every man and to 'repent when he did amiss'.


1 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 169.
3 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 150.
5 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 6.
Though Gore insists that "it is only a reunited Church which can be really or fully catholic",¹ his strong catholic beliefs lead him to declare that the Church of England could not accept Non-conformist ministers as being validly ordained, or their sacraments as valid sacraments, or their ministrations as valid ministrations without cutting off themselves with the Non-conformists from the fellowship of the ancient Church, and from all hope of reunion on a catholic basis, for instance, with the Eastern and Russian church.² Thus, despite his strong desire for union, for Gore, any union must have a Catholic basis.³

¹ Gore, Christ and Society, p. 170.
² Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 170. Gore was practically engaged in attempts at church union, assisting in preparations for the World Conference on Faith and Order, (Prestige, op. cit., pp. 374, 414, et. al.) and was chairman of the committee to assist the Archbishop of Canterbury in the oversight of Anglican-Orthodox and separated churches of the far-East relations. Ibid., p. 449. This latter position took him on two tours of the Middle East in his later years, one in 1923 (Ibid., p. 466) and the other in 1925. Ibid., p. 489. Too, Prestige reports of Gore that "he was anxious for co-operation with Nonconformists in Biblical study and efforts for social welfare, and wanted men of different points of view to meet frankly, face religious difficulties together, and gain a better knowledge of one another". Ibid., p. 255.
³ Cf. Charles Gore, Steps Toward Unity (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1919), p. 15. Therefore, Gore is apprehensive of the union of the Church of South India and lays down as one of the necessary conditions to the union that there must be no recognition on the part of Anglicans that non-episcopal ordinations are valid. Charles Gore, "Reunion in South India", Church Quarterly Review CX (July, 1930), pp. 233 ff. In reference to Church unity Gore states: "I have recently gathered from the Press
The Church as King

As Christ was prophet and priest, so, according to Gore, He was king.\(^1\) He taught His disciples that He was the true Messiah in the form of the "suffering Redeemer".\(^2\) Further, because Christ is the very image of God, He is "the summary authority in religion".\(^3\) This authority, Gore claims, is exemplified by His teachings and actions in which He refers to Himself saying not, "This is the Word of the Lord!",\(^4\) but, "I say unto you".\(^5\)

Gore emphasizes that "the Church is kingly, it is a royal priesthood... because it partakes of the regal character that some one has been good enough to say of me that, though I have a great zeal for reunion, no one is a greater obstacle to its realization." Gore, Steps Toward Unity, p. 5.

1 Cf. ante p. 232.

2 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 114. Gore points out that Christ deliberately chose to enter Jerusalem upon a young ass as the Messianic king described by Zechariah, and indicates that His greeting upon the triumphal entry was the public assertion of His Messianship. Ibid., pp. 141 ff. Gore also indicates that as the Messianic belief was that the king from the house of David was to be the centre of the kingdom of God, so Christ's "little flock" was in some sense the kingdom of God on earth. Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 153. Cf. Gore, The Lord's Prayer, p. 42.

3 Gore, The Incarnation, p. 173.

4 Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 50.

5 Loc. cit.
of Christ".  

1 Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 66.

2 Ibid., p. 48.


the body he belongs to",¹ he is careful to point out that the authority of the Church rests "simply upon the word of God".²

Neither will Gore have it that the Church's authority is anything like absolute; rather: "The true type of Christian authority must . . . always make its appeal so as to commend itself to the conscience and reason of man."³ Accordingly, Gore alleges that the authority of the Church "is an authority which seeks to stimulate and guide, not to drug or suppress the judgment of the mass of Churchmen",⁴ and that the Church's message, though it is "by its very nature authoritative",⁵ will satisfy the felt and experienced wants of the soul and will convince the hearer of its own divinity by its applicability to his need.⁶

The Kingship of the Church Over Itself

Gore maintains that when Christ established His Church "He appointed officers in the persons of the Twelve Apostles of whom Peter was the chief".⁷ "He gave them authority . . .

¹ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 119. Cf. Ibid., p. 122.
² Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 160.
⁴ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 175.
⁵ Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 31.
⁶ Loc. cit. This is very reminiscent of Coleridge, cf. Chp. II, ante p. 51.
⁷ Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 176.
to 'bind' and 'loose,' that is, to legislate by prohibition or permission, and to absolve and retain sins, that is, to exercise discipline over individuals. This binding and loosening authority "is the authority to admit individuals to the Church or to exclude them as unfit, to exclude them as unfit, to excommunicate and to absolve."  

Further, Gore feels that this authority is absolutely necessary for the Church's corporate life. He is certain that the power to bind and to loose was a part of the Christian community from its conception, and states that though we ought certainly 'to stretch toleration as far as we can . . . there are necessary limits'. Speaking practically, Gore declares that, according to the Prayer Book, membership involves discipline. Therefore, he asserts: "We have to restore to Church membership its reality of moral obligation." Further, Gore attests that the Church's standards in its discipline should be patterned after Christ; "the Church which

3 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 256.
4 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 79.
5 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 43.
6 Gore, Dominant Ideas, pp. 20 f.
7 Loc. cit.
is His body must be—exclusive indeed where He would have been exclusive, but inclusive where He would have been inclusive. Gore points out that the Church's legislative enactments as well as her disciplines have a "divine sanction"; "what she binds on earth is bound in heaven". However, he also states that the Church's power is legislative, not absolute. Accordingly, though it is the Church's duty to judge and excommunicate, those excommunicated are to be left to God, and the Church is not to profess to pass the final sentence on them.

Thus, though the Church, according to Gore, has a spiritual character, it is also an association of human beings, "a society with quite definite limits, ties, and obligations". These limits, ties, and obligations apply to the whole Church, the laity as well as the clergy. Though Gore asserts that they should be few in number, the limits of the Church should be "such as involve saying: 'If you will not conform to this, you cannot share our fellowship, and must be, from our point of view, outside and not inside our body'". Gore states:

1 Gore, <i>Holy Spirit and the Church</i>, p. 219.
2 Gore, <i>Roman Catholic Claims</i>, p. 37.
3 Ibid., pp. 37 f.
4 Gore, <i>Holy Spirit and the Church</i>, p. 49; Charles Gore, <i>The Question of Divorce</i> (London: John Murray, 1911), p. 47.
5 Gore, <i>Holy Spirit and the Church</i>, p. 30.
6 Gore, <i>Epistle to the Ephesians</i>, p. 164.
No Christian society can be healthy unless there is some obvious means by which those acting in open defiance of Christian law shall forfeit the privileges of Christian communion.

Further, Gore points out that the Apostle Paul anathematized those who preached another Gospel than that which he had preached, and that St. John's epistles allow no false teaching. Therefore, he maintains that the Church should not veer from the "firm standing ground of the apostolic faith". As indicated, Gore considers essential to catholicity the catholic creeds, sacraments and the requirements of holy order, and he agrees with what he considers to be the limits of antiquity asserting: "Nothing, it held, could be made a matter for catholic requirement in respect of doctrine which had not always in substance belonged to the faith of the church and which could not appeal for confirmation to the Bible."

In the light of this, Gore laments the fact that the modernist movement has led men "to ignore the plain obligations contracted in ordination of fidelity to the creeds."

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 132 f.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 168; Gore refers to Gal. 1:8-9.
3 Ibid., p. 170; Gore cites 2 John: 10-14 (Reference given as John: 9)
6 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 35.
sists that the Church of England requires its ministers to mean what they say when they give assent to the creeds.  

... a man after a time must make up his mind; and when he has come to the conclusion that he does not believe that we have adequate grounds for asserting that our Lord was in fact born of a virgin, or rose again the third day from the dead, he cannot legitimately, or with due regard to his public sincerity, retain his position as an officer in a church which requires of its officers the constant recitation of the creeds.

This position Gore took so seriously that, while in his Worcester bishopric, he forced the case of one of the vicars of his diocese, who gave evidence of modernist sympathies, to the point where the vicar resigned his living.

However, Gore is not entirely happy with the dogmatic requirements of his own communion. He points out that the Thirty-nine articles "appear to have been intended not as de-

1 Gore, New Theology and Old Religion, p. 166.


3 Prestige, op. cit., pp. 243 ff. Nevertheless, as indicated, though Gore wishes to protect the standards of the Church, he refuses to subordinate the dictates of the individual conscience to a higher standard of truth. Cf. Chp. IV, ante p. 196. "Now I cannot deny that at the last resort every man is bound to follow his conscience, even when his conscience is perverted or mistaken. Thus we cannot believe that even those who have left the Christian Faith altogether, under what seems to them the irresistible pressure of conscience, even a mistaken conscience must, we feel, be the way by which they will reach the true light at last." Charles Gore, Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, p. 52.
inite solutions but rather as 'articles of peace',\(^1\) and that they "bear with them almost throughout the savour of a by-gone situation . . . are deeply repugnant to the spirit that one may call modern or critical or liberal",\(^2\) therefore, he maintains that they "ought to cease to be regarded in any sense as a theological standard".\(^3\) He would substitute for them the Nicean creed as the standard of doctrine to be accepted by the clergy.\(^4\)

In reference to practical reforms, Gore indicates that in the early Church the election of the bishop by the congregation was almost as strongly insisted upon as the necessity of sacramental ordination,\(^5\) and therefore, he asserts that a reform of appointing bishops is necessary so that the ancient practice would be again instituted.\(^6\) Also, he proposes that the jurisdiction of any particular bishop should be limited to his proper diocese,\(^7\) that Baptism should be administered on Sundays and Holy Days when the greatest number of people are pre-

---

\(^1\) Gore, *Mission of the Church*, p. 49.

\(^2\) Gore, *Anglo-Catholic Movement*, p. 27.

\(^3\) Gore, *Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 354.


\(^5\) Gore, *Christ and Society*, pp. 86 f.


\(^7\) Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, pp. 161 f.
ent,\(^1\) that ministers should baptize only the children of their own parish,\(^2\) that if infants are baptized, they should have sponsors for surety,\(^3\) and that those baptized are "to renew their vows of baptism through their own lips before they can be confirmed".\(^4\) Again, he insists that at Holy Communion there should be a sufficient number of communicants,\(^5\) that the right of reservation, with which Gore himself had so much difficulty throughout his ministry,\(^6\) rests with the bishop,\(^7\) and that there is no justification to introduce the late Roman practice of each priest saying his mass every day.\(^8\)

Gore defines laymen as those who have been baptized and confirmed and who have continued in the fellowship by the breaking of bread and have not publicly been convicted of some scandalous offence.\(^9\) In fine, "laity" means "faithful members

---

2 Ibid., p. 113.
3 Ibid., p. 102; Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 4.
4 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 4.
5 Gore, War and the Church, p. 36.
6 Prestige, op. cit., pp. 182, 184, 294, 379 f., et al.
7 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 58.
8 Ibid., p. 56. For other denunciations of Roman practices cf. ibid., p. 54. However, Prestige reports that one of the reforms which Gore instituted as Canon of Westminster was the institution of the daily Eucharist. Prestige, op. cit., p. 165.
of the body of Christ". As to lay discipline, though Core insisted that those who "teach a particular creed should be required to express their personal adhesion to it", he does not suggest doctrinal tests being applied to the laity in general. However, he regrets the inactive part played in the Church of England by the laity and feels this lack of lay response causes a "false sacerdotalism" among the clergy. Therefore, Core suggests means for allowing the lay people of the Church a more active part both in worship and in Church affairs. He proposes that the congregation should join in the recitation of the creed, that the Church congregation should have a voice in the election or at least in the acceptance of its ministers, that they have a right "to elect, or at least to approve the men who are to serve as presbyters and deacons as well as control these officers when elected, that the clerical and lay houses should sit together for most diocesan pur-

1 Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 23.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 237.
3 Loc. cit; Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 25; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 75.
4 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, pp. 112 f.
5 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 54.
6 Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 91. Gore specifies suffrage for all those on the roles after 21 years of age who have not been convicted of scandalous offence. Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 25.
7 Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 12.
poses as a diocesan conference or governing body,¹ and that the laity should have the power of veto on any proposed change in the ecclesiastical standard, i.e. on the Book of Common Prayer.²

There are few problems on which Gore is more outspoken than on the question of divorce. So concerned was he with the problem that he wrote an entire, if somewhat thin, volume on the subject.³ In it Gore maintains that in the past the Church as a whole taught the indissolubility of marriage,⁴ and therefore, retracting his argument, which he put forth fifteen years before in his exposition of the Sermon on the Mount,⁵ he insists that the marriage tie is permanent,⁶ and interprets that the exception which Christ is recorded to have made in the case of fornication, according to the Gospel of Matthew, as "an inconsistent interpolation".⁷

Accordingly, Gore would have the Church of England hold

¹ Gore, War and the Church, p. 93.
² Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 19.
³ The Question of Divorce.
⁶ Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 3; Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 133.
fast to the law of the Church as it stand *viz.*, "that marriage once validly contracted is indissoluble, except by death of one of the parties, in such sense as admits of either of them contracting another valid marriage".¹ Therefore, he agrees with the standards of the Anglican communion which recognize civil marriage only if it has been "properly monogamous"² and that people married in contradiction to the Church law are not to be admitted into the Church.³

Another practical problem which Gore dealt with and one about which he became almost irate was that of Church establishment. He avows that the establishment is both "inconsistent with the actual state of beliefs in the nation, and a real disadvantage to religion on the whole".⁴ "It is a scandal that the Church being what she is should be so tied in the fetters of the State as to have no freedom to manage the affairs committed to her by Christ."⁵ Like the Tractarians before him, who, he asserts, "had already begun to rekindle among Churchmen the sense of the distinction between the law of the church and the law of the state",⁶ Gore declares that "the Church and

¹ Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 50.
² Ibid., p. 56.
³ Gore, War and the Church, p. 106.
⁴ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 357.
⁵ Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 29.
⁶ Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 9.
are fundamentally distinct and relatively independent societies,"¹ that church and state laws do not necessarily coincide,² and that the appointment of bishops by the Prime Minister "is an appalling anomaly".³

Asserting that the identification of Church and State was a noble ideal but one on which "subsequent events have cast a sinister light",⁴ Gore avers that the Church ought to desire "the restoration to the Church of that power of self-govern-ment which ought never to have become alienated from it".⁵ He declares: "We ought to demand of the state liberty within our own communion to live by our own law."⁶ Hence, he demands reforms in Church courts so that the primary court in spiritual cases should be the bishop's court and beyond that should lie the provincial court consisting of bishops guided by, but never superseded by, legal advisors.⁷


² Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 53.

³ Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 44. Cf. Ibid., p. 45.


⁵ Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 78.

⁶ Gore, Question of Divorce, p. 54.

⁷ Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, pp. 43 ff.
The Kingship in the World

Gore maintains that it is the Church's paramount duty to follow the injunction of Christ and go into all the world to propagate the Gospel; hence, it has a missionary obligation. The Church's missionary duty depends chiefly on Christ's command, but he declares that the obligation "is made intelligible when we realize that Christianity is really a catholic religion." The New Covenant is for all flesh.

However, the Church's relation to the world, for Gore, includes much more than its missionary duties. It is to be the instrument through which Christ will accomplish His purpose of redeeming mankind, the visible organ through which Christ is to act upon the world. The Church is to be an example and a power. Gore asserts that Jesus founded a theocracy which was to act as a leaven in a corrupt world, "the city set on a hill." It is to be "the light of the world", "the salt of the earth." Moreover, the Church is to repre-

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 112.
2 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 138.
3 Gore, Essays in Aid of Reform, p. 9.
5 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 192.
6 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 98.
7 Gore, Dominant Ideas, pp. 111 f.
sent the "true humanity of sonship to God and brotherhood among men". 1

In contrast to the Church today which, according to Gore, has strangely forgotten its function to establish a visible example of the kingdom in the world, 2 he commends the medieval Church, evil though it was, stating:

It never failed to present the kingdom of God as a visible society on earth in which every activity of man, every aspect of his individual and corporate life, was to be brought under the obedience of Christ. 3

He avers that, like the City of God described by Augustine, the Church "is a heavenly civitas, set up in the midst of the earthly, yet forever distinct from it, founded on a contrary principle." 4 It is to let its light so shine that it will provoke to jealousy those who are outside of it. 5 Gore is convinced that "it is the social, human, brotherly power of the Church which is what is at the present moment best calculated to win the consciences and convince the intellects of men". 6

---


3 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 110.

4 Ibid., p. 92.

5 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, 92.

6 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 137.
On the practical side, Gore insists that love of Christ means love of brother. ¹ "There is no real love of God which does not find expression in the deliberate service of men." ² Therefore, the Church must let the world know what it stands for, "what its real mind is about the foundations of society, about the relation of man to man and class to class and nation to nation". ³ For where the nation owns allegiance to Christ there the Church must insist that relations of individuals, classes, and nations must be controlled in accordance with its fundamental principles. ⁴ Gore laments the fact that the Church is "content to go about with an ambulance cart . . . when it ought, as well, to have been thundering like the old prophets". ⁵ "The Church should become again a society as hostile to the worldly world as He who is proclaimed its Master." ⁶

Consequently, Gore commends both Luther and Calvin for


² Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 188. Cf. Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 84.


⁴ Gore, Christ and Society, pp. 130 f.


⁶ Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 112.
attempting to deal with social issues saying that they "had not
the least intention of letting the life of industry and the re-
lations of buyer and seller escape from the control of reli-
gion". He contends that the present condition of society, in-
dustry, and international relations is unsatisfactory, that
commercial morality needs regarding, that political reforms
need considering, that the emancipation of women is called
for, and he declares: "We clearly need careful re-statement
for Christians of the responsibility of wealth."

Accordingly, asserting some of the notions which he avows
have been familiar ideas since the time of Frederick Maurice
and the Christian socialists as well as being in accordance
with Christ's mission presented by Ecce Homo, Gore declares:
"Jesus Christ is really the Saviour and Redeemer of Mankind,
in its social as well as its individual life, and in the pres-

1 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 126.
2 Ibid., p. 15. Cf. Ibid., p. 136.
3 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 134.
4 Ibid., p. 141.
5 Ibid., p. 137.
6 Ibid., p. 135.
7 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 18. Cf. Charles Gore,
Strikes and Lockouts: The Way Out (London: P. S. King & Son
Ltd., [n. d.]), p. 5.
8 Gore, Anglo-Catholic Movement, p. 18.
ent world as well as in that which is to come. 1

Christ "certainly meant His Church to be a fellowship of men bent on 'rebellion' against a world of needless suffering". 2 "There was a fund of fiery indignation in the heart of Jesus", 3 and "against no persons or actions did it blaze so fiercely as against those who exploited the weak and helpless for their own pleasure or profit". 4 Hence, the Church should thunder at the gates of tyranny and "tear the cloak of respectability off the strongholds of evil . . . to force men to choose . . . between their Christian profession and their selfish, anti-social, claims". 5 Christians are guilty of something like moral apostacy when they are at liberty "to make money out of slum-dwellings . . . or to sweat their work people; or to invest their capital in commercial enterprises without any regard for the good of mankind". 6 Gore maintains that there needs to be a reconstruction of the conception of

---

1 Gore, Christ and Society, p. 18.
2 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, pp. 335 f.
3 Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 68.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 191. Cf. Gore, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 70; Gore, Christ and Society, p. 53.
6 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 121. Gore expresses the need of a new casuistry which would be "an exposition of how Christians ought to act in the different departments of social life". Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 133. Cf. Gore, Strikes and Lockouts, pp. 7 ff.
the right of private property,¹ and that the maxim ""business is business""² is an expression of a "flatly anti-Christian philosophy and sociology".³ Thus Gore asserts that where the Church has influence, it also has civic duties,⁴ that it should make its voice heard in international politics,⁵ and challenge the nations to repent.⁶

Gore declares that all Christian Churches should work together on equal footing "to maintain the moral witness in every town and country district".⁷ He credits Maurice, Westcott, and Holland as being prophets of Christian social principles,⁸ and states: "We should seek to re-organize the forces of what perhaps can be called by no better name than Cope which means the Christian Order in Politics, Economics and Citizenship",⁹ an organization which "must take into its purview all that concerns our social life and home in town and country--

¹ Gore, Christian Moral Principles, p. 94.
² Gore, Christ and Society, p. 128.
³ Loc. cit.
⁴ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 118.
⁶ Gore, Christ and Society, pp. 152 f.
⁷ Gore, Dominant Ideas, p. 34.
⁸ Gore, Christ and Society, pp. 168 f.
⁹ Ibid., p. 169.
everything that concerns the making of adequate external provision for the propagation and development of human life". 1

Thus, the Church which is to exercise its prophetic office in the main by teaching moral principles along with doctrinal, to fulfil its priestly function by the realization of moral growth, and the reconciliation in bodily unity, is to effect its kingly mission by the exercise of moral discipline over its members and moral leadership in the world. Hence, Gore maintains that Christ cares above everything else for the moral meaning of the Church. 2

1 Loc. cit.

2 Charles Gore, The Social Obligations of a Christian (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1912), p. 8. Gore's intense sociological concern is reflected by his activities with the Christian Social Union of which he became president upon the occasion of Westcott's death in 1901. Prestige, op. cit., p. 241. Cf. Ibid., pp. 81, 91 ff., 110 et al. Other of his activities which indicate his social concern are: his speaking before the House of Lords in relation to the budget of 1909, (Ibid., p. 279) his advocacy of the Wages Board Bill, (Ibid., p. 191) his enthusiasm for the Worker's Educational Association formed in 1903, (Ibid., p. 232) his opposition to the Educational Bill of 1906, (Ibid., p. 297) his condemnation of allied retaliation policies during World war I, (Ibid., p. 389) and his efforts in support of the League of Nations. Ibid., p. 405. Also Gore became a share holder in a large London store, according to Prestige, "solely in order to attend the shareholders' meetings and to protest against the oppressive treatment of employees". Ibid., p. 179.
CHAPTER VII

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH

The Sacraments in General

In consequence of his idealistic philosophy, Gore asserts that the sacramental principle is that the spiritual is imparted through the material.¹ For him, the whole universe is sacramental.²

The principle that spiritual values and forces are mediated through material processes is a principle that runs through nature as a whole. . . . Truth and beauty and goodness are spiritual values and forces. But all of them within our experience arise and become effective only under material forms. And human life in all its forms of fellowship is full of natural sacraments, such as the lover’s kiss and the friend’s handshake and the soldier’s flag, which both express and kindle the respective feeling.³

"Thus handshaking is the sacrament of friendship and kissing the sacrament of love."⁴ However, when expounding his doctrine of the sacraments, Gore becomes somewhat more restrictive in the use of the term.

Referring to St. Paul's account of the "breaking of bread" as practiced at Corinth, Gore asserts: "The earthly and the heavenly, the natural and the supernatural, are brought into the most startling proximity. This is sacramentalism indeed."¹ Gore declares that "the Church from its origin was unmistakably and deeply sacramental—that it certainly believed in the divine gifts ministered through earthly rites".² Defining the sacraments, he states that the sacraments of the Church "are acted symbols: but symbols in the sense that the outward act or visible thing really is or involves its spiritual counterpart".³ Hence, Gore agrees with the assertion of the Church of England which is, he maintains, "that the sacraments are symbols, and not only symbols—that they also effect or convey what they symbolize—they are 'practica' or 'efficacia signa gratiae'".⁴ Thus, "the natural thing is used as an instrument or vehicle of what is supernatural, spiritual and divine".⁵ The treasure, as St. Paul puts it, is

¹ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 134.
² Ibid., pp. 135 f.
⁴ Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 174. Gore asserts that the definition of the Church of England in general as "effectual signs of grace" is simply the definition of the Roman schools. Loc. cit.
⁵ Gore, Body of Christ, p. 112.
borne in earthen vessels.¹

Though Gore admits that the mystery religions can be reckoned as elements in the divine preparation for the spread of the Gospel,² he asserts: "In the genesis of Christian sacramentalism no probable place can be found for Hellenism."³ He declares that all of the sacramentalism of the New Covenant has its roots in Jewish soil and that the sacramental belief is already present before contact with Hellenism can reasonably be imagined to have taken place.⁴

Neither is a belief in sacramentalism contrary to what we know of Christ. Gore points out that Christ did not disrespect Israel's worship⁵ or depreciate the Jewish priesthood or sacrifice,⁶ rather: "He appears to have attended the feasts and kept the Passover; and He is recorded to have spoken with reverence of the altar like a pious Jew."⁷ Therefore: "We

¹ Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 183.
² Gore, Can We Then Believe? (London: John Murray, 1926), p. 115.
³ Ibid., p. 118.
⁵ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 57.
have no critical justification for calling in question the institution by Christ, as sacraments or sacred rites of His New Israel, the ordinances of baptism and the eucharist.\(^1\) The Gospel records leave little doubt, according to Gore, that Christ countenanced Baptism and instituted the Eucharist,\(^2\) and Gore points out that St. Paul no doubt believes that Baptism and the Eucharist were instituted by divine appointment.\(^3\)

As the sacraments are outward and visible signs, so for Gore, are they communal rites.\(^4\) As such they protect the religion of common man from the perils of individualism\(^5\) and are safeguards to the Church's unity.\(^6\) As already indicated Gore asserts that the sacraments are one of the requisites for the unity of Christ's body which is the Church.\(^7\) He declares that "the sacraments, which are means of personal grace, are also

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 52. Gore asserts: "Baptism, it would seem, was already in the time of our Lord (with circumcision and sacrifice) the rite for the incorporation of the Gentile proselytes into the community of Israel." Loc. cit.

\(^2\) Cf. post pp. 302 ff., 314 ff.


\(^5\) Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 120 ff.

\(^6\) Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 108.

\(^7\) Cf. Chp. VI, ante p. 265. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 27.
social ceremonies: ceremonies only possible among members of a society,¹ and that "the reality of our obligation to maintain the unity of the society is brought home to us by the institution of the visible sacraments."²

Gore maintains that "the sacraments supply the soul with its necessary nourishment in such a way as to keep it in dependence upon the body, the church".³ Thus: "The Church is . . . the environment of the soul, the sacraments constitute the external supply."⁴ The sacraments are "the orderly distribution of the bread of life in the family or household of God".⁵ Therefore, Gore holds that the sacraments tie the individual Christian to the membership in the appointed human brotherhood.⁶

Thus, by making sacraments, visible ceremonies of a visible society, to be the instruments of spiritual grace to the individual—by making these social sacraments to be the provided means of personal salvation—God has made it apparent that His salvation is no gift to isolated individuals, but

¹ Gore, Body of Christ, p. 41.
³ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 177.
⁴ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 71.
⁶ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 147.
a gift given to members of a body, a gift for membership.¹

However, though Gore admits that "a cultus is necessary for any common religion",² he would not have the sacraments regarded as charms, as, he contends, was the case to a great extent in the popular medieval system.³ He would disallow that children not in danger of death be baptized where there is no fair prospect of their being brought up in the understanding of Christian faith and practice.⁴ Hence, he insists:

... the Christian Church has never taught that either baptism or any of the sacraments can make men good by merely being administered to them. Besides sacraments, faith and conversion are necessary to salvation.⁵

Consequently faith is not antagonistic to the sacraments,⁶ for: "Sacraments are no more opposite to faith than food is opposite to hunger."⁷ Gore asserts: "The sacraments supply the spiritual nourishment, objectively as it were from outside;

¹ Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 45 f.
⁴ Cf. Gore, War and the Church, p. 102. If the sacraments have no charm-like quality one is led to ask why baptism of children in danger of death is considered.
⁶ Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 71 f.
⁷ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 176.
but faith is the mouth which receives it and the converted heart is the appetite which can assimilate it.¹ Again:

The sacraments, duly administered, supply you with the bread of life, the portions of meat in due season; but the sacraments will not do you spiritual good, unless you have faith to desire and to use them.²

Thus, Gore holds that the value of the sacraments to each individual depends upon the welcome the individual gives it.³

Hence, he regrets the fact that in Christian preaching the sacraments on the one side and faith and conversion on the other have been torn asunder,⁴ and he declares that "one can no more choose between faith and the sacraments than, when you want to play the fiddle, you have to choose between the fiddle and the bow. You will want them both."⁵ In fine, Gore writes:

No one can read St. Paul with an open mind without seeing that he believed the Christian rites to be, by the divine power of the Spirit, ordained channels or instruments for the bestowal of spiritual gifts. But it is at least equally evident that he demands for the profitable use of all such divine gifts the response of faith and the will of obedience.⁶

---

1 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 120.
2 Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 83.
4 Gore, Creed of the Christian, pp. 79 f.
5 Ibid., p. 83. Cf. Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 120.
6 Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 119 f.
As to the necessity of the sacraments Gore first quotes Hooker as stating: "It is not ordinarily God's will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments", but adds, "yet God is not tied to any special channels." Consequently, Gore declares that though the sacraments are necessary to salvation, "we do not limit the power of God to give to individuals what He wills to give outside all sacraments, in this life or beyond it". Again, Gore speaks of the sacraments as being necessary "for those who can have them"; thus, those outside the possibility of the Church's rites are not necessarily cut off from the gifts of God. Gore claims for the sacraments, therefore, not that they are exclusive channels of grace "but that through them only, as elements of His [Christ's] unique covenant, are definite graces pledged and guaranteed by the Divine fidelity". (This in spite of the fact that he asserts that "the grace of God is found as much in His Word as in His Sacraments.") Gore's position is, then, that the fact that God can work outside His appointed channels

---

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 24; Gore quotes Hooker, E. F. v. 57. 4.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 46.

4 Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 64.

5 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 25.

6 Gore, Reflections on the Litany, p. 68.
does not destroy the authority of the ordinances themselves, for he is convinced that doing away with the authority of the ordinances would do away with the standards of the Church altogether.¹ Gore writes:

God is not tied by His own ordinances, but can give where and as it pleases Him. We do but declare that the sacramental method is the stated and normal law of His kingdom, and therefore the law to which we at least are bound, alike in prudence and in love, to conform our practice and our expectations.²

Closely associated with the necessity of the sacraments is Gore's discussion of their validity. As the sacramental gifts are valid through the Spirit's action without action on the part of man and their reception,³ so in the administration of the sacraments, their validity does not depend on the administrator. Quoting Pope Stephen and St. Augustine Gore states: "'The unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the grace of the sacrament,' because the Holy Spirit, and not they, is the giver of the grace; they neither 'give it nor add force to it.'"⁴ Neither does moral unworthiness of the administrator of the sacraments interfere with their validity.⁵

² Gore, Body of Christ, p. 47.
³ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 71.
⁵ Ibid., p. 96.
Becoming somewhat more explicit in his discussion of sacramental validity, Gore gives assent to Hooker's requirement of "intention", which he maintains is necessary "to guard against the possibility of the sacraments being consecrated by accident, through the chance collocation of words and materials".\footnote{Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 156.} This he expresses in the words of Canon Estcourt:

\begin{quote}
'The intention requisite for the valid administration of a sacrament is the intentio generalis faciendi quod facit ecclesia.' Hence a sacrament conferred with the correct matter and form by a heretic, or even an atheist, is valid, if he intends to do that rite which the Church does,--and not specially the Roman Church, but the Church in confuso; even though he might not believe in the reality of the sacrament.\footnote{Loc. cit., quoting Canon Estcourt, The Question of Anglican Ordinations, p. 199.}
\end{quote}

From this it would seem that any church at all regardless of its organization, or any organization regardless if it were a church or not, or any individual regardless of whether he was part of an organization, could confer valid sacraments if it were his intention to do so; "even though he might not believe in the reality of the sacrament".\footnote{Loc. cit.} The conclusions of this argument if carried to its logical limits would certainly run outside the bounds of Gore's doctrine of the Church. However, Gore solves this difficulty by pointing out that "the opposite of secure or valid is not non-existent, but precari-
ous",¹ and, for Gore, validity or unprecariousness is bound up with the Church.

... the church must be regarded as having authority to determine the conditions of administration—that is, to decide what constitutes a "valid" sacrament, meaning by the word "valid" a sacrament which the church recognized and ratifies.²

Therefore, as the Church is bound up with the doctrine of Apostolic Succession so is the validity of the sacraments.³ Hence, Gore states not only that "with the apostolic succession we [the English Church] have retained the valid administration of all the Sacraments",⁴ but further: "We must hold to this doctrine of apostolic succession as bound up with the validity of some at least of the sacraments."⁵

Thus, generally Gore maintains that though valid sacraments can be administered anywhere by anyone, he would consider those outside the catholic church, i.e. those not possessing apostolic succession, as being precarious. However, though generally he is insistent that in no case can God be considered tied to His own channels, in a more partisan catholic frame of mind, he asserts of the spiritual gift imparted through the

² Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 47.
⁴ Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 95.
This inward life depends on outward means. Without Baptism, without the "laying on of hands," which gives the gift of the Holy Ghost in His personal indwelling, without the Eucharist, without absolution, we cannot have or retain the inward gift; and those external channels depending, as we all acknowledge they do, on the apostolic ministry, connect the inward life of the Church at once with her outward organization.\footnote{1}

Another ambiguity that is apparent in Gore's discourse on the sacraments is their number. Though he points out that for more than ten centuries the Church did not talk about seven sacraments, yet he avows that it regarded the rites of absolution, penance, ordination, marriage, and anointing of the sick with the view to their recovery, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist, as having in somewhat different senses sacramental power.\footnote{2} Hence, in his \textit{Religion of the Church}, along with the two great sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion, he treats as sacraments \textit{Confirmation}, \textit{Penance}, \textit{Matrimony}, \textit{Ordination} and \textit{Unction of the Sick}. These, he claims, are reckoned as sacraments in the greater part of the Catholic Church.\footnote{3}

Discussing the sacramental acts individually Gore maintains: "The proper matter of confirmation is the laying on of hands", "the minister of confirmation is the bishop".\footnote{4}

\footnote{1} Gore, \textit{Roman Catholic Claims}, p. 30. This statement would seem to negate much of what he usually holds.
\footnote{2} Gore, \textit{Holy Spirit and the Church}, p. 299.
\footnote{3} Gore, \textit{Religion of the Church}, p. 47.
\footnote{4} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 52.
Like Ordination, Confirmation signifies consecration for service, the confirmed person being a fully equipped member of Christ with proper duties and rights of membership; hence, Confirmation is "the completion of baptism". Gore also refers to it as "an act of benediction", incorporating the laying on of hands by which is bestowed the dwelling of the Holy Ghost. Penance has to do with the forgiveness of sin which Gore is certain was a power which Christ gave to the Church in the command, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained". The essence of the doctrine of penance is the act of receiving a member back into the communion after he has repented from the scandalous act for which he was expelled, thus showing marks of true penance or having "done penance", i.e. having confessed his sin and submitted himself to the judgment of the Church, after which he is welcomed back into the "holy fellowship" by absolution. Holy Matrimony is, for Gore, as has been pointed out, indis-

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., p. 47.
3 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 9.
4 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 60; Gore quotes from John 20:22,23.
5 Ibid., p. 61.
soluble. It is sacramental only because ratified and rendered indissoluble by God—'those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder.' Apologizing for regarding Anointing of the Sick as a sacrament, Gore maintains that "side by side with the ministry of the physician, we ought to recognize spiritual influences for the healing of the body." Taking his cue from James 5:14, Gore maintains that, as St. James advised, those to whom he was writing to have the elders pray over them in case of illness and gave assurance that the prayer of faith would save him that was sick, the Church today ought to continue the practice. The Sacrament of Ordination has to do with holy orders—bishops and priests, as ministers of Christ. The doctrine of the ministry, for Gore, is inexorably bound up with the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Thus, every minister of the Church must have received ordination from those before him who had the power to ordain and "who had in their turn received it step by step from the apostles." Hence,

1 Cf. Chp. VI, ante pp. 277 f.
2 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 65.
3 Ibid., p. 67.
4 Ibid., pp. 67 f.
5 Ibid., p. 68.
6 This is explained in detail in Part III entitled, "The Ministry", post pp. 338 ff.
7 Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 69 f.
the ministry of the sacrament of Ordination is the bishop and
the process is that of laying on of hands accompanied by prayer
or formula which was regarded as sacramental, that is, as an
outward visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace thereby
given.\textsuperscript{1}

Thus, the sacramental rites which Gore names "the 'port-
tions of food in due season,' the orderly distribution of the
bread of life in the family or household of God", consist of
seven acts of the Church, which carry the divine gift with
them and, hence, are sacramental.\textsuperscript{2} Therefore, Gore gives
credence to the seven sacraments of the Roman Communion.\textsuperscript{3}
Nevertheless, he states: "No doubt we must maintain the pre-
eminence of baptism, completed in confirmation, and the eucha-
rist."\textsuperscript{4} To these we now turn.

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., pp. 70 f. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church,
pp. 143 f. The laying on of hands, Gore affirms, was the nor-
mal instrument of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Ibid., p.
131.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, pp. 183 f.; Gore, Holy
Spirit and the Church, Appended Note B, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{3} Gore asserts: "The enumeration of seven sacraments we
first find in Gregory of Bergamo (twelfth cent.), but his list
is made up of baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, ordination,
maintenance, Holy Scripture, and the taking an oath. There was no
tradition of seven sacraments. It is Peter Lombard in the next
century who gives us the seven with which we are familiar."
Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, Appended Note B, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{4} Loc. cit. Cf. Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 41 f. In as
has been explained, Gore himself admits that the entire crea-
tion is in a sense sacramental in that it expresses spiritual
meaning through the material, he states: "The sacraments are
According to Gore, "Baptism . . . was already in the time of our Lord (with circumcision and sacrifice) the rite for the incorporation of Gentile proselytes into the community of Israel." Hence, he asserts that Christ re-established the Jewish rite of Baptism, and that the rite was taken over by the Catholic from the Jewish Church. Further, Gore declares:

As used by John the Baptist, baptism was based upon the need to constitute "a people prepared for the Lord" . . . and, according to the Fourth Gospel, John's baptism was carried on in the circle of the disciples of Jesus.

"outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us." In their principle they are in harmony with the whole system of the material universe. For everything visible in the world expresses some spiritual meaning and contains some spiritual force." Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 44. From this one wonders if it is proper to deduce that there are only seven sacraments. Gore reaches his conclusions on the basis of antiquity, that is, taking his pattern from the Church, but there is no doubt some question about the legitimacy of stopping where he does if his idealistic presuppositions of all creation being sacramental is taken seriously. It is no doubt true that if all things are really sacramental there no longer exists differentiation between some of the Church's actions and others and therefore no action in particular can be considered a sacrament. Hence, the doctrine of the sacraments falls away all together.

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 52.


3 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 45.

4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 52; Gore refers to John 4:12.
Therefore, Gore supposes "that baptism in the literal sense was an institution of Christ's which the apostles administered from the first on His instructions,"¹ a supposition which, according to Gore, is further substantiated by Christ's command, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into [or 'in'] the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost!"² Gore also avows that "St. Paul's language also (in Eph. v 25-6) seems to attach it [the rite of baptism] to Christ".³ In sum Gore states:

... the original prophecy of John the Baptist coupled with the record of the Acts, indicating the undisputed position of baptism from the first, suffice to warrant the belief that Jesus Christ took over the ceremony of washing, freed from animal sacrifices and circumcision, from the Jewish Church as the ceremony of initiation into the New Israel ...⁴

For Gore, Baptism is a two-fold effect. It is both a ceremony of personal cleansing and the rite of admission into the Church.⁵ It incorporates the new birth,⁶ the washing away

¹ Ibid., p. 53.


³ Ibid., p. 54.

⁴ Loc. cit.


⁶ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 297.
of sin, as well as being "a ceremony of admission into a visible society," "a ceremony of incorporation into Christ and His Church." Thus:

The baptized person who has hitherto been only a member of our sinful humanity is hereby regenerated by the Holy Ghost; that is, he receives a new birth or incorporation into Christ and His body. He becomes a member of Christ's family, with all the privileges of membership; and can claim, in Christ's name, the forgiveness of his sins.

Judging by his terminology, it would appear as if Gore was, in the matter of Baptism, being true to his Tractarian heritage. The *locus classicus* of the Tractarian doctrine of Baptism is Fusey's *Tract 67* entitled, "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism", the appearance of which, according to Newman, marked Fusey's full association with the Oxford Movement. Fusey declares that the churches "described not defined the


gifts of God in Baptism. He speaks of the rite as involving "deliverance from sin", "a renewal to holiness", "death unto sin", "a new birth unto righteousness". Again, it is "regeneration", or a channel by which one becomes "a member of Christ". Hence, "life in Christ" commences when we are by Baptism made "members of Christ".

With this position Gore, at first sight, would seem to agree. However, a vast difference becomes apparent when Fusey's doctrine of sin is compared with Gore's. For Fusey, man in Adam possesses an actual "corrupt nature", and Baptism is the putting on of a new nature. Hence, Fusey writes:

... our birth in Adam is corrected and replaced by our birth of God in Christ: as we are really sons of man by physical birth, [by which Fusey means actual participation in Adam's sin and possessing a corrupt nature] so are we really and actually 'sons

---

2 Ibid., p. 21.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., pp. 21, 22, 23.
5 Ibid., pp. 21, 27, 28. Cf. Ibid., pp. 25, 43, 46 ff.
6 Ibid., pp. 22, 42, 66.
7 Ibid., p. 21. Cf. Ibid., p. 112.
8 Ibid., p. 28.
9 Ibid., p. 117.
10 Ibid., pp. 110 ff.
of God,  

by spiritual birth; sons of man, by being born of Adam, sons of God by being members of Him who is the Son of God.  

Therefore, all Pusey's statements as to the effect of Baptism have meaning only in reference to man's state of actual corruption before Baptism as compared with the new nature with which he is bestowed in the Sacrament.

In that Gore does not admit that sinful man really possesses a corrupt nature, such as must actually undergo change when one becomes Christian, his terms "new birth", "washing away of sin", and "regeneration" necessarily have a vastly different connotation from those of Pusey. This is evident from the context in which the terms are used. For Gore, regeneration is a "new birth" into the Church; it is the action of being united to Christ and admitted to the fellowship of His body, or the "spiritual endowment of his [man's] nature". The washing away of sin is of such effect that it is not a once for all matter, but must be constantly renewed. The new birth is birth into a "new spiritual status", i.e. into

1 Ibid., p. 117.
3 Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 49 f.
4 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 65.
5 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 74.
6 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 214.
the Church. 1 Again, Gore speaks of the baptized person as being "consecrated and hallowed", 2 and "consecration" is equated with "sharing the life of a consecrated people". 3

Thus, it would seem quite evident that, for Gore, the only real meaning of Baptism, in spite of the fact that he retains all the Biblical terminology, is that it is the initiation ceremony into the Church. Thus, he writes:

Incorporation into Christ or His body, the being invested in a new spiritual nature which is Christ, "cleansing" from defilement mediated by washing, a new birth into a new spiritual status—all these phrases convey the same idea, and the process thus variously described is assigned to the same agent, the Holy Spirit, with the same external rite as its instrument. 4

In reference to the age of those eligible for Baptism Gore avows: "It is probable that the Church from the beginning took over from the Jews the practice of baptizing the children of proselytes." 5 He supports this position with evidence from the Didache 6 in which the phrase "'the little proselytes'" oc-

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 126. Gore also refers to it as "a fresh incorporation upon a fresh stock". Charles Gore, The Permanent Creed and the Christian Idea of Sin (London: John Murray, 1905), p. 34.

2 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 31.

3 Ibid., p. 32.

4 Ibid., p. 130.

5 Ibid., p. 150.

curs. Again he maintains: "The phrases in Acts xvi. about both Lydia and the jailer at Philippi—'he was baptized, he and all his,' 'she and her household'—suggest it."\(^1\) Also, he asserts that "St. Paul appears to address children as already 'in the Lord' (Eph. vi. 1)".\(^2\) Hence, Gore holds that Baptism in infancy under the right conditions "embodies a fundamental Christian principle and comes down from the origin of Christianity".\(^3\) And, in advocating the practice of baptizing children he states:

> While still infants they are made "members of Christ" in baptism, so that the life of Christ may accompany and consecrate the very beginnings of feeling and intelligence.\(^4\)

However, while admitting that the infant children of Christians were apparently baptized from the beginning,\(^5\) he declares:

> ... the original idea of baptism included the response of the individual will, quite as obviously as the bestowal of divine grace. Thus the normal kind of baptism was the baptism of the adult; and in the case of infants the requirement of sponsorship was

---

1 Gore, *Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 130.
2 *Loc. cit.*
3 Gore, *Epistle to the Romans*, I, 215. Gore adds: "By infant baptism under right conditions, I mean the baptism of infants where there is some real security provided, through their parents or proper sponsors, for their Christian education, according to the intention of the Church." *Loc. cit.*, note 3.
4 Gore, * Creed of the Christian*, p. 76.
5 Gore, *Christ and Society*, p. 79.
no doubt made very real. 1

Gore has little patience with indiscriminate Baptism. He adjures that "it must be confessed that the method of indiscriminate Baptism, whether as practised in barbarous or in civilized times, reverses the fundamental method of Christ".2 Further, he blames indiscriminate Baptism which has been practiced since the days of Constantine for the loss of ethical distinctness and moral power which the Church as a corporate body has suffered, 3 and therefore, he laments the existence of a system which has caused infants to be baptized as a matter of course.4

Gore expresses admiration for the highly systematic and prolonged preparation necessary for candidates for Baptism in the sub-apostolic and later period prior to the Edict of Constantine.5 However, he admits that this elaborate preparation for Baptism contrasts with the speed with which it was administered in the earliest period as appears in Acts, though even there, he declares, "the first act of confession--that 'Jesus

1 Loc. cit.
2 Ibid., p. 104.
3 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 192.
5 Gore, Christ and Society, pp. 77 f. In this matter Gore refers to F. J. Brightman's "terms of communion" in his Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry.
is the Christ' or 'the Lord'—was followed by more detailed instruction after initiation."\(^1\) Gore reminds his readers that according to the Book of Common Prayer each infant being baptized should be provided with sponsors and that those who were baptized as infants must renew their vows through their own lips before being confirmed.\(^2\) As a practical reform he proposes that ministers should baptize only children of their own parish.\(^3\)

According to Gore, the primitive mode of baptism was by immersion.\(^4\) He substantiates this position with reference to the Didache:

\begin{quote}
'If thou have not living [\textit{i.e.} running] water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. And if thou have not either [in sufficient amount for baptism, \textit{i.e.} immersion in the water] pour forth water thrice upon the head into the name of Father and Son and Holy Ghost.'\(^5\)
\end{quote}

---

\(^1\) Gore, \textit{Christ and Society}, p. 78.


\(^3\) Gore, \textit{War and the Church}, p. 103.

\(^4\) Gore, \textit{Epistle to the Romans}, I, 214.

\(^5\) Ibid., II, Note P, 237; Gore quotes from Didache c. 7. Brackets in original. Gore also makes reference to Dr. Taylor, \textit{Teaching of the Twelve Apostles} (Cambridge, 1816), p. 52. Again, he points out that, according to the Jewish rite, anything that broke the continuity of the contact with water such as a finger-ring or a hair band was held to invalidate the act. Loc. cit. Furthering his argument, he asserts: "The Greek word, 'baptize,' like the Hebrew tabal [\textit{tabal}] means, 'to dip'; to 'baptize' a ship is to sink it." Loc. cit. Again, he gives evidence that both Hermes and Barnabas refer to going down into and coming up out of the water. However, he also declares
Baptism Completed in Confirmation

For Gore, Baptism can hardly be considered as a complete sacrament. It must be completed by Confirmation. He maintains that Baptism and Confirmation should be regarded as two parts of one ceremony and that both should be publically administered. He asserts that in the early Church Confirmation was regarded as "the completion of baptism," and that "in the Acts Church appears as ministering both the washing with water and the laying on of hands as parts of one sacrament of initiation" involving both the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Also, as has been already indicated, Confirmation signifies consecration for service, the confirmed person being a fully equipped member of Christ with proper duties and rights of membership.

However, it is the fact that Gore considers the rite of Confirmation to involve bestowal of the Holy Ghost that gives

that Barnabas indicates that though immersion was the normal way of administration, it was no longer insisted upon as necessary. Loc. cit; Gore refers to Hermas Simil. 9; and Barnabas, Chapter xi.

1 Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 51 f.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 117.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 52. Cf. ante p. 299.
the ceremony its greatest import for him. He points out that in the Book of Acts the gift of the Spirit was in the first instance given to the original nucleus of believers by sudden effusion, but adds that "for subsequent adherents of the new fellowship it was given . . . through baptism, which was regarded as the instrument of the forgiveness of sins and incorporation into the community, and was accompanied or followed by the gift of the Spirit, normally attached to the laying on of hands". Here we see that Gore himself differentiates between the two parts of the sacrament. The first, as has been explained, being the action of the Holy Spirit, but the latter is the rite in which the Holy Spirit is given. "The communication of the Spirit after baptism by the laying on of hands appears, after Pentecost, to be . . . taken for granted." And, though he maintains that the gift of the Spirit "appears as given in an objective manner in baptism and the laying on of hands", and that "the rite of baptism, as commonly spoken of, included the laying on of hands", he gives priority to the latter act as far as the bestowal of the Spirit is concerned. He writes:

1 Cf. Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 9; ante p. 299.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 53.
3 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 105.
"By one Spirit were we all baptized into one body" --yet to the laying on of hands was attached that full indwelling of the Spirit which equipped each "member" to play his part in the royal and priestly body.  

Hence: "By baptism men were spoken of as incorporated into Christ. With the laying on of hands was associated the bestowal of the Spirit." Moreover, for Gore, this bestowal has a permanent nature.  

Henceforth a Christian had no need to ask for the Spirit as if he were not already bestowed upon him; he had only to bring into practical use spiritual forces and powers which the divine bounty had already put at his disposal.  

Again, though Gore maintains that Baptism and Confirmation are parts of a single sacrament, he differentiates the two rites in considering their administrators. He maintains that in the tradition of the early centuries, the administration of Confirmation by the laying on of hands was restricted to the bishop, that in the early church both the acts were administered together at the season of Easter, the bishop's presence being needed for the second part of the ceremony but not for the first. Gore is anxious to retain this privilege.  

---

1 Ibid., p. 132.  
2 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 58.  
3 Loc. cit.  
5 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 51. However, it would seem that the Apostle Paul's not having performed the sacrament
of the bishop in the act of laying on of hands, the bestowal of the Holy Spirit: an attitude which goes hand in glove with his contentions that only bishops have power of ordination, a rite in which is also involved the bestowal of the Holy Ghost.\(^1\) Hence, he speaks of ordination and confirmation in the same breath, both involving the laying on of hands and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, and therefore, both necessitating a bishop as administrator.\(^2\)

The Eucharist

According to Gore: "The greatest of all the sacraments of the Church is Holy Communion."\(^3\) He asserts that "the privilege of Communion is the highest and most comprehensive privilege of Churchmen."\(^4\)

The Holy Eucharist is the greatest of the sacraments ... because it is both the divine feast and the altar of perfect sacrifice and the perfection of

---

\(^1\) Cf. ante pp. 301 ff.; Section III, Chp. VIII, post pp. 362 ff.

\(^2\) Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 51 f.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 53.

\(^4\) Gore, War and the Church, p. 107.
brotherly fellowship. And it is also the greatest act of Christian worship, because, with the Lord's Prayer, it is the only act of Christian worship which Christ himself instituted.¹

Further, Gore maintains that there is no reasonable ground for doubting that Christ himself instituted the Eucharist.² He points out that St. Paul's account in I Corinthians 11:23 ff. indicates that it was already the formulated tradition of the Church a very few years after the crucifixion.³ It was a part of the tradition which St. Paul had received either at his conversion or at his first visit to Jerusalem not more than six or nine years after the crucifixion; therefore, it was, Gore propounds, "already part of the formulated tradition of the Jerusalem Church".⁴ He declares that this conclusion is supported by the Petrine tradition in the Gospel of Mark and the Palestinian tradition in the Gospel of Matthew.⁵ Hence, Gore

² Ibid., p. 54.
³ Ibid., pp. 54 f.
⁴ Ibid., Can We Then Believe? p. 106.
⁵ Ibid., p. 107. Therefore, Gore disagrees with Bousset and the critics of his school, who maintain that the sacramental ideas and rites of St. Paul, particularly those connected with the Eucharist were not derived from either Jesus or the earlier Jerusalem Church, but originated in the Hellenistic Churches of Syria where sacramentalism under the influence of the pagan mystery religions developed in Christianity. Gore, Belief in Christ, Note A, p. 99. Cf. Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 199 ff., Note 10 wherein he gives his reasons for preferring the shorter text in St. Luke's account of the institution of the Eucharist, (Luke
maintains that the Church should restore the place and dignity of the Holy Eucharist, which means placing it at the centre of the worship service.²

Like Baptism, Gore asserts that the Eucharist has its roots wholly in Jewish soil. He declares that "it was developed out of the rites and associations of the Passchal sacrifice and meal".³ As before indicated, Gore points out that Christ did not disrespect Israel's worship,⁴ depreciate the priesthood or the sacrifice,⁵ or share the horror of the Essenes in regard to animal sacrifice.⁶ Rather, Gore argues, St. Luke depicts Christ

---

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 199 f.

2 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 119. Gore asserts: "A church life in which the eucharist is not the centre, for all the vigour which it may show in learning, or preaching, or philanthropy, is after all, but a maimed life." Loc. cit.

3 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 18. Mascall, in his book, Corpus Christi, wherein he has a chapter entitled, "The Eucharistic Theology of Charles Gore", points out that though since Gore's time the fact of the Jewish origin of the Eucharist has been strongly stressed, that "there were very few who saw its significance at the time when Gore was writing". E. L. Mascall, Corpus Christi (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953), p. 143.

4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 57. Cf. ante pp. 289 f.

5 Gore, Philosophy of the Good Life, p. 150.

6 Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 111.
as having been brought up to keep the ceremonial law and attend the Passover.\textsuperscript{1} Further, Christ is recorded to have spoken reverently of the altar like a pious Jew.\textsuperscript{2} Again, Gore declares: "Presumably He [Christ] regarded the animal sacrifices as a divinely sanctioned institution which demanded fulfilment, and to which He Himself was to give fulfilment."\textsuperscript{3} Therefore, in reference to sacrificial worship: "He came not to destroy, but to fulfil."\textsuperscript{4} "He [Christ] interprets His own immediate death as a sacrificial death which is to be the basis of a New Covenant."\textsuperscript{5}

Hence, Christ was the priest and the victim. He offered the sacrifice and the sacrifice He offered was Himself.\textsuperscript{6} Gore interprets Christ's sacrifice as fulfilling the Jewish sacrificial system in two aspects. In its purpose it was an atonement for sin, but in its form it was more of the nature of the peace offerings in that Christ both offers the sacrifice of His body and blood and at the same time called upon His disciples

\textsuperscript{1} Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{2} Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{3} Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{4} Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 112.
\textsuperscript{5} Loc. cit. According to Gore, Christ's sacrificial death was according to the idea of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, Chapter 53 (Gore, Belief in Christ, p. 59) as well as having reference to Zechariah, Chapters 11 and 12. Gore, Can We Then Believe? pp. 198 f., note 9.
\textsuperscript{6} Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 147.
to feed upon it.\textsuperscript{1} Consequently the Eucharist is the institution of Christ for His Church, "a perpetual memorial of Himself as so sacrificed, whereby in some spiritual way they [the members of the church] were to eat His sacrificed body and drink His outpoured blood".\textsuperscript{2} Thus, according to Gore, the life imparted to the Christian by Baptism and the laying on of hands, by which the convert joins the Church, is nourished in the sacrament of the Eucharist by the elements of bread and wine.\textsuperscript{3}

Gore stresses the fact that the elements eaten actually become Christ's flesh and blood, and therefore, he is not satisfied with the explanation of the eating of Christ's flesh and blood which makes it simply a metaphor for believing in Him or receiving His words.\textsuperscript{4} On the contrary, the nourishment imparted is "in some real sense, the flesh and blood, or body and blood, of Christ".\textsuperscript{5} Gore adjures: "We eat and drink the

\textsuperscript{1} Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{2} Gore, Can We Then Believe? p. 111.

\textsuperscript{3} Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 66. Cf. Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 76, where he writes: "As the life of the body is sustained with regular meals, so the life of the soul is regularly nourished with the body and blood of Jesus, that is, the very essence of His person, human and divine, in Holy Communion."

\textsuperscript{4} Gore, Body of Christ, pp. 21f.

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 3. Cf. Ibid., pp. 17, 55, 71 f., 74, 86.
body and blood of Christ that was broken and poured forth. "
"We are to eat and drink His sacrificed flesh and blood." 
Hence, Christ is "most truly there present among us in His 
body and His blood, under the humble forms of bread and wine." 

Hence, Gore agrees with Hooker who in turn agreed with 
both the Lutherans and Calvin in this matter, and he avows 
that Calvin "asserted in the strongest language the actual and 
substantial communication to us in the sacrament of Christ's 
body and blood, His life and self, to be our spiritual food."
However, for Gore, as for Calvin, the sacrament both symbolizes 
and communicates the body and blood of "the living Christ", that

1 Ibid., p. 62.
2 Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 147.
3 Gore, Creed of the Christian, pp. 86 f.
4 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 53.
5 Ibid., pp. 53 f. Gore here has reference to Paget's 
in which is contained a collection of passages from Calvin. 
Calvin's own words on the matter are "... our souls are fed 
by the flesh and blood of Christ, just as our corporal life 
is preserved and sustained by bread and wine". John Calvin, 
Institutes of the Christian Religion, translated by John Allen 
(Seventh American Edition; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of 
Christian Education, 1936), II, 650. "And it must always be a 
rule with believers, whenever they see the signs instituted by 
the Lord, to assure and persuade themselves that they are also 
accompanied with the truth of the thing signified." Ibid., 
p. 651. Again: "I say, that the sacred mystery of the supper 
consists of two parts: the corporal signs, which, being placed 
before our eyes, represent to us invisible things in a matter 
adapted to the weakness of our capacities; and the spiritual 
truth, which is at the same time typified and exhibited by 
those symbols." Ibid., p. 652.
is, "the spiritual food". Christ "spiritually" though "really" minglest Himself with the earthly elements.

The earthly priest, who represents the whole Christian people, invokes the power of the Spirit upon the bread and wine; he blesses them with the recitation of Christ's words of institution, and lo! in a way which passes our power to fathom, like all the deep things of nature and grace, the divine Spirit acts upon the earthly elements and consecrates them so that invisibly and spiritually, yet really, they become in the midst of the Church the body and blood of the glorified Jesus.

In the Eucharist Gore asserts: "We ask for and receive the whole Christ for our whole selves." Gore agrees with what he describes as having been expressed by Athanasius and the Church generally, that "the eucharistic body and blood are the very body and blood in which Christ lived and died and rose and ascended . . . the same body only not now in its material particles, but in its spiritual principle and virtue". "The body and blood are spiritual, they are indistinguishable or inseparable from the living person, the whole Christ." It is Christ as He is in the heavenly places who feeds us with

2 Gore, *Creed of the Christian*, p. 86.
3 Ibid., p. 87.
4 Ibid., p. 60.
5 Ibid., p. 61.
6 Ibid., p. 65.
His own life. Thus, it is "the 'flesh and blood' of the glorified Christ, for no other exists".

The person who now feeds us with His own very life, divine and human, is He who is set before us in a vision of the Apocalypse as a "Lamb as it had been slain," but alive for evermore in the heavenly places.

Hence, Gore is in agreement with the standards of his own communion. He writes:

... with reference to the Holy Eucharist in particular the Church of England unmistakably teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are therein given, taken and eaten, after a spiritual and heavenly manner ...

But Gore will not have it that there is a simple identification between the elements and Christ's body and blood. He states: "The Gift accompanies the material bread and wine, but is to be distinguished from it". Further: "This eating does not mean a consuming of any material atoms or elements of Christ's body: it means absorbing the spiritual forces of

1 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 55.
2 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 66.
3 Loc. cit. Thus, Gore strongly objects to the view which he states is held by some Anglicans, namely that "there is postulated in the eucharist some real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ as they were when He was dying or dead upon the cross". Ibid., pp. 161 f. Further, he maintains that "it seems wholly unintelligible how divines who in any sense believe in a real presence can speak of the eucharistic body—one hesitates even to write the words—as 'the corpse' of Christ". Ibid., p. 183.
5 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 64.
His humanity". Hence, Gore states:

The words of our Lord, "This is my body: this is my blood," ... must be taken to mean that the elements in the eucharist become by the operation of the Holy Ghost something mysterious and holy that they were not before, but without ceasing to be in all material respects exactly what they already were.

Thus, Gore protects himself from the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, a dogma which he claims is "involved not only in metaphysical, but in historical difficulties". He points out that "the dogma of transubstantiation is closely allied with a deeply monophysite tendency in the Church", and conflicts with "the principle that the supernatural does not destroy the natural substance or nature, but only elevates it to a higher plane".

In his polemic against the doctrine, Gore also draws upon his idealistic philosophy. He writes: "Plainly modern phil-


2 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 111.

3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 193.


6 Mascall refers to it as "a quasi-Kantian idealism". Mascall, op. cit., p. 153.
osophy of all schools recognizes no distinction between substance and accident. On this basis, therefore, Gore objects to the more modern interpretation of transubstantiation by Roman theologians which allows the bread and wine to be "something objectively real" as denying the real sense of transubstantiation. Thus, the doctrine "remains as little more than a verbal incumbrance due to an inopportune intrusion into church doctrine of a temporary phase of metaphysics." He adds:

In its original and more natural meaning, transubstantiation—the overthrowing of the natural substance by the spiritual—is truly contrary to a fundamental Christian philosophy, and really "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament."

In that Gore is so insistent on the actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, he necessarily holds that this presence is independent of the faith of the individual partaking of the sacrament. Consequently Gore declares that it is the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements that makes them Christ's body and blood. Thus, the

1 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 120.
2 Ibid., pp. 119 f. Cf. Gore, Reservation, p. 32.
3 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 120.
4 loc. cit. It would seem that even a greater objection to transubstantiation than that which Gore points out is the fact that, because the dogma insists that the earthly elements of bread and wine are actually changed into the earthly elements of the body and blood of Christ, it is a flat denial of the resurrection.
5 Ibid., p. 74.
6 Ibid., p. 86.
body and blood of Christ, "the 'ghostly substance' of the sacrament," is present in the sacrament before reception.

... by consecration of the portions of bread and wine ... the spiritual gift of Christ's body and blood is, in some way, attached to these elements ... before they are eaten and drunken, and independently of such eating and drinking.

Therefore, though the faith of the individual digests the food of the sacraments, and hence, the sacrament is not a charm, (thus, Gore writes: "Though multitudes receive the gifts, only some appropriate them by faith") Christ's presence in the sacrament is not dependent upon the faith of the individual.

However, Gore does not divorce the presence of Christ in the sacrament from faith altogether. In fact, he goes so far as to assert that it is relative to the faith of the Church in the same way--again drawing on his philosophical idealism—as the relations which are necessary for the objects in the ob-

1 Ibid., p. 232.
2 Ibid., pp. 231 f.
3 Ibid., pp. 71 f.
4 Cf. ante pp. 292 f.; Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 80, where Gore states; "The sacraments actually convey to us the food of our souls as the gift given from without, but they do us no good unless there be a spirit in us awake to what is being given, welcoming the gift and ready to 'assimilate' or digest it into our spiritual system." Cf. Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 37.
5 Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 81.
jective work are dependent upon the mind. "Relations are the work of mind, and relations are necessary to make objects." These relations, as has been indicated, depend, for Gore, upon the universal mind, i.e. God. Hence, in referring to his philosophical concepts of the Eucharist, Gore states:

... it is God who makes the bread to be the body of Christ and not man (as it is God who makes the objects in the natural world and not man), yet He makes this spiritual reality to exist relatively, not absolutely; in such sense as to exist only for faith, the faith of the believing and worshiping Church, just as He creates the world relatively, not absolutely, that is, to exist for the rational beings and by action of thought.

Just as the objects of nature do not depend for their reality on the mind of the individual but "upon mind in general", "so the spiritual presence of Christ in His body and His blood ... rests not on the precarious faith of any individual, but is so relative to the faith of the church as a whole ... as that apart from faith, or for one who in no way shares it, it can no more in any intelligible sense be said to exist than the beauty of nature can be said to exist.

1 Gore, *Body of Christ*, pp. 149 f.
2 Ibid., p. 151.
3 For Gore's epistemological argument cf. Chap. IV, ante pp. 150 ff.
5 Ibid., p. 152.
For what is quite without reason".\(^1\) In both cases, then, for Gore, "existence" means "relation to a consciousness"\(^2\)—in the case of natural reality to "rational sensibility", in the case of the presence in the Eucharist to "spiritual faith".\(^3\)

In this way Gore attempts to solve two problems with a single argument. The first is the problem raised by a doctrine of the absolute objectivity of the presence of Christ in the sacraments which leads to questions as to the effect of the sacrament when taken by those totally without faith.\(^4\)

This question, Gore asserts, "is only one stage removed from the question of what would occur if the sacrament were eaten by an animal without reason".\(^5\) The second problem which Gore here attempts to solve is that of the presence in the sacrament being dependent upon the faith of the participant.\(^6\)

Gore's answer to both is that Christ's presence in the Eucharist is dependent upon the "spiritual faith" of the Church in which the individual must share to have the presence exist for him. Hence: "The eucharistic presence because it is spiritual, is relative to the faith of the church, and presupposes 'holy

---

1 Ibid., pp. 152 f.
2 Ibid., p. 153.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., pp. 143 ff.
5 Ibid., p. 149. Gore records that to this question, "the master of the sentences [Peter Lombard] replies, "'God knows'". Loc. cit.
6 Ibid., p. 152.
persons' to receive 'holy gifts.'

Mascall is quite correct in his critique of this view when he states that "its conclusion stands or falls with the quasi-Kantian Idealism which underlies it." 

However, in arguing against the reservation of the sacrament for purposes of worship, Gore puts forth an argument for the relative objectivity of the presence in the sacrament that displays profound thought. He declares:

The eucharistic presence . . . because it is present for a certain divinely defined purpose; and (as a consequence of this) it is a presence to certain persons—that is, the sons and daughters of faith. 

In this case Gore does not ground the reality of the presence on the validity of his epistemological argument, but on the will of Christ.

The bread and wine are instruments of His [Christ's] will which He can at pleasure use or discard; and to which He is in no subtlest way subjected. The only secure argument is that the gift was given for a certain purpose, and so long as that purpose is observed we have absolute reason to trust that His promise will not fail us.

Elucidating further, Gore compares the presence of Christ

1 Ibid., p. 142.


3 Gore, Body of Christ, pp. 141 ff.

4 Ibid., pp. 132 f.
in the Eucharist with His appearances after the resurrection. Like them, so in the sacrament Christ was/is present to certain persons for certain purposes.¹

As in the risen and glorified body in itself, so in its sacramental application to our necessities, spiritual purpose dominates everything with an absolute freedom. The presence is controlled by the purpose.²

This purpose, Gore contends, is to enable us to "partake of a heavenly under the form of an earthly nourishment".³ "Christ is presented to us under the forms of bread and wine, as our food."⁴ Hence, he asserts: "The sacrament was instituted in order to be eaten."⁵ It is not to be "'reserved'", (except for the communion for sick or absent brethren) "'lifted up, or worshipped'".⁶

Gore's own difficulties with the problem of reservation

¹ Ibid., pp. 133 f.
² Ibid., p. 131.
³ Ibid., p. 134.
⁴ Gore, Theological Bearings of Certain Uses of the Sacrament, p. 5.
⁵ Gore, Body of Christ, p. 134.
⁶ Loc. cit. Gore points out that reservation for purposes of extra-liturgical cultus, which was not known in the Church for 1000 years, is the inevitable logical consequence of transubstantiation. Gore, Theological Bearings of Certain Uses of the Sacrament, pp. 6 f. Cf. Gore, Reservation, p. 42. It is interesting to note that Gore records that when he was young he used to love the Roman devotion of the sacrament. Ibid., p. 47. Thus, he is to be credited for changing his attitude in his maturity in the light of theological evidence.
while a bishop reflect that he carried this attitude into practice. He continually refused permission to allow the sacrament to be reserved anywhere except in a locked chapel and there only for the purpose of administration to the sick.¹

The Eucharist as Sacrifice

As already indicated, Gore maintains that Christ brought back the idea of sacrifice by His instituting the Eucharist.² He declares: "There can be no question that from the earliest days the Christian Church thought of the eucharist as a sacrifice."³ In line with this Gore asserts that though Christ fulfilled the sacrificial system⁴ by offering the perfect sacrifice,⁵ "The abolition of any further need for propitiation is not the abolition of sacrifice. It is but the setting free of humanity to offer, unimpeded by the alienation which sin had caused, the sacrifices proper to man."⁶ Gore attests

---

¹ Cf. Prestige, op. cit., pp. 182, 184, 390 ff., 422, 446, et al.
² Gore, Epistle to the Romans, I, 147.
⁴ Ibid., p. 164; Gore contends: "He had done, spiritually and effectually, once and for all, what the one inaugural sacrifice of the old covenant and the annually recurring day of atonement had done symbolically, but outwardly only and ineffectually."
⁵ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 26.
that the New Testament is full of the ideal of the Church offering sacrifices. He mentions "the sacrifices of alms giving" (Hebrews 8:15-16), "the sacrifice of ourselves" (Rom. 12:1), "the sacrifice of prayers and intercessions" (Rev. 5:8, Cf. I Tim. 2:1, I Peter 2:5), and "the sacrifice of sufferings" (Rom. 15:16, Col. 1:28).\(^1\) In addition, Gore asserts that "the first Christian theologians were full of this thought".\(^2\) He avows that "the Eucharist was especially called the 'spiritual' (or 'rational') and 'bloodless' sacrifice".\(^3\)

However, the sacrifice of the Eucharist, for Gore, "does not effect any renewal of the sacrifice of the cross".\(^4\) Thus, he opposes the Roman position which he calls "a view which involves in each mass in some real sense a re-sacrificing of Christ".\(^5\) He maintains: "The Eucharist is not even mystically a renewal of Christ's passion but an act of co-operation with Christ's heavenly intercession."\(^6\) Therefore, it constitutes

---

1. Ibid., pp. 168 f.
2. Ibid., p. 169; Gore cites Clem. Rom. ad. Cor. 36 and Origen de Orat. 10.
5. Ibid., p. 179.
a sacrifice in relation thereto.\(^1\) Hence: "Christ upon the
Eucharistic altar is only 'offered' in the sense that his
once-made sacrifice is there perpetually presented and pleaded
before the Father, as in heaven, so on earth."\(^2\)

The sacrifice of the Son of Man once offered in
death has been accepted in glory. In the power
of that sacrifice Christ ever lives, our high
priest and perpetual intercessor, the continually
accepted propitiation for our sins unto the end
of time.\(^3\)

Explaining the first of three views of the Eucharist as
a sacrifice, Gore declares that the chief expression of the
bloodless sacrifice was in the presentation of the bread and
wine to the Father in the name of the Son as a memorial of
Christ's passion.\(^4\) Therefore, the consecration of earthly
offerings which were to become Christ's body and blood was
understood to mean that they had been accepted at the heavenly
altar and united to Christ's heavenly offering.\(^5\)

A second view that Gore presents of the Eucharist as a
sacrifice is bound up with the consecrated elements. These
being in the midst of the congregation are viewed as the body
and blood of Christ prior to Communion. This condition, says

\(^{1}\) Cf. Mascall, op. cit., p. 147.
\(^{2}\) Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 177.
\(^{3}\) Gore, Body of Christ, pp. 183 f.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 162.
\(^{5}\) Ibid., p. 185.
Gore, "effects a special nearness of the church to the one sacrifice."¹ Gore maintains that this view of a near but yet external presence of the one sacrifice among the worshippers is occasion for the Church "to offer", to join Christ "in His unceasing heavenly action".² He explains further by quoting Cyprian: "'The passion of the Lord is the sacrifice we offer.'³

However, for Gore, the sacrifice of the Eucharist is consummated in communion.⁴ "What He [Christ] does first for us, He must ultimately do in us."⁵ Thus, a third position of the Eucharist as a sacrifice which Gore explains is bound up with the participant offering himself. Gore declares: "The true Christian idea of sacrifice makes the substance of it to be always persons returning to God the life He gave them."⁶ "This offering in sacrifice of ourselves and others is rendered possible by the one effectual sacrifice through which alone we and all men have access to the Father."⁷ And by offering ourselves we participate in Christ's sacrifice, we become our-

---

¹ Ibid., p. 193.
² Loc. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 194. Gore cites Cypr. Epp. lxiii. 4. This interpretation would seem to come dangerously near to using the elements other than for the purpose of eating them.
⁴ Ibid., p. 199.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 199 f.
⁶ Gore, Epistle to the Romans, II, 177.
⁷ Ibid., II, 178.
selves "sharers of His sacrifice--ourselves the sacrifice we offer." Hence, in eating Christ's flesh and blood, we are admitted to share the fellowship of Christ's life thus sharing the eucharistic sacrifice.² He writes:

In the holy eucharist we come solemnly before God, as His people met for the commemoration of our redemption, to present to Him the sacrifice of our persons and our goods, our alms and our oblations, our prayers and our praises.³

And he sums up:

... the eucharistic sacrifice essentially involves and implies the offering of the Church as the body of Christ, that is, the offering of ourselves as members of the body ... And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee.⁴

Besides being a sacrifice, Gore points out that the Eucharist "was regarded as the new and true Pascal celebration;⁵

---

4 Gore, *Epistle to the Romans*, II, 100 f. T. F. Torrance maintains that rather than participating in Christ's intercession the Church on earth only echoes the eternal intercession of Christ in its eucharistic worship. T. F. Torrance, "Eschatology and the Eucharist", *Intercommunion*, edited by Baillie & Marsh (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952), p. 324. Further, Torrance points out that the interpretation of the Eucharist as an offering or sacrifice of ours, which offering or sacrifice then becomes identified with Christ's sacrifice, involves "an entire displacement of the centre of gravity, for after all, what the Eucharist proclaims is not our offering but Christ's offering on our behalf". *Ibid.*, p. 331.
it is an outward ceremony involving a fraternal meal;¹ it is a fellowship;² it is the sharing together of Christ's body and blood.³ Thus, the Eucharist has relevance to the unity and fellowship of the Church. As an illustration of the unifying significance of the divine presence Gore points to the activity of the Spirit at Pentecost, who "when He came to make the church one, symbolized His coming in a fire which appeared first as one and then divided and distributed itself in fiery tongues".⁴ Gore avows that when Christ made the eucharistic ceremony the central sacrament of His religion "He must have meant that the communion (or sharing together) of all His people in Him . . . was to be its governing idea".⁵ Therefore, Gore asserts: "The sharing of the good things which God provides for our nourishment is one of the chief means of realizing the unity in the Christian body",⁶ a unity which is symbolized in the "one loaf" of the Eucharist.⁷ Consequently,

² Gore, Holy Communion, pp. 39 ff.
³ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 54.
⁴ Gore, Body of Christ, p. 95; Gore refers to Acts 2:3: "There appeared to them tongues like as of fire, dividing (or R. V. marg. 'distributing') themselves."
⁵ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 54.
⁶ Gore, The Lord's Prayer, p. 63.
⁷ In reference to the place of the Eucharist and Church unity, T. F. Torrance maintains that the common partaking of
Gore asserts: "The Eucharist is nothing if it is not social. Its whole natural basis as a common meal implies a community."¹

Summing up he states:

"... it is not merely a gift to the individual receiver; it is a sharing together or communion in the body and blood of Christ. We share together, not merely with those who are kneeling at the same altar, but with all Christ's people, the living and the dead, the great company which no man can number, in one communion and fellowship. Thus, the body of Christ renews the body which is His church, and the blood, which is the life of Christ, reinvigorates its common life."²

Again, Gore declares: "The Eucharist is the extension of the Incarnation."³ He asserts: "The doctrine of the Eucharist which we must attribute to St. Paul and which represents the strongest tradition in the Catholic Church, justifies this phrase."⁴ It will be remembered that, for Gore, the Church is the extension of the Incarnation because of the immanence of Christ in the members of the Church.⁵ In the present context Gore avows: "Especially by means of the Eucharist by the different churches may well be a means to unity, a means of healing their divisions. Hence, he refers to the Eucharistic elements as "the divine medicine for their [the Churches] healing". Torrance, "Eschatology and the Eucharist", op. cit., p. 349.

¹ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 40.
² Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 55 f.
³ Gore, Can We Then Believe? Note 13, p. 212.
charist Christ is in us—in His Church. Gore maintains that feeding on His flesh can mean nothing less than "an inflowing of His manhood into ours"; and therefore, that Christians are, through the fellowship in the manhood of Christ, "made partakers of the divine nature which is also his". Hence, the Incarnation is extended in the Eucharist because in the Eucharist Christ becomes immanent in those who partake of His flesh and drink of His blood.

Thus, Gore's theory of the Eucharist as the extension of the Incarnation goes hand in hand with the doctrine of it as a sacrifice. Because the Christian in the Eucharist partakes of the very life of Christ, a thought which is, according to Gore, "a central idea of the New Testament", Christ is so extended in the Christian that he can therefore "share in the eucharistic sacrifice".

1 Gore, Can We Then Believe? Note 13, p. 213.
5 Gore, Body of Christ, p. 16.
6 Ibid., p. 201. Though it must be admitted that Gore both expounds and protects his doctrine of the Eucharist as a sacrifice exceedingly well, one is forced to question whether it does not stand upon the belief that Calvary was not a once for all affair, an affair that Christ is in heaven in the process of completing.

In reference to the eligibility to celebrate the eucha-
rist, it is of interest to note that Gore points out that though the common doctrine is that "only a priest can offer or consecrate the Eucharist", (Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 202) Tertullian gives evidence that it is possible in case of necessity for a lay man to administer both Baptism and the Eucharist. Ibid., pp. 204 f. Giving practical suggestions in reference to the eucharistic service, Gore objects to the commandments being constantly recited at the beginning of Holy Communion, (Charles Gore, Dominant Ideas and Corrective Principles (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1918), p. 132) suggests that the litany is properly and originally a prelude to the Eucharist, (Gore, Reflections on the Litany, p. 4) and that non-fasting Communion is to be preferred to abstaining from Communion. Charles Gore, The Anglo-Catholic Movement Today (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1925), p. 35.

PART III

THE MINISTRY
CHAPTER VIII

THE BASIS AND THE FUNCTION OF THE MINISTRY

The Ministry Instituted by Christ

According to Gore: "Christ Himself instituted a ministry in the persons of His apostles, intended plainly to endure to the end." Hence: "Christ founded not only a church, but an apostolate in the church." Gore asserts: "Our Lord deliberately organized His disciples as 'the Church' and bound them together in obedience to the Twelve." Therefore, as opposed to Lindsay's argument that the authority of the ministry rested on the Church, Gore asserts that "Christ, the Founder, did, in instituting His church institute in it a pastoral office, an office of authority, derived not from the church but from Himself".


4 Charles Gore, Orders and Unity (London: John Murray, 1909), p. 77; Gore has reference to Dr. Lindsay's The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries (Hodder and Stoughton, 1903), pp. 33 f.

5 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 132.
the authority of the apostolate did not accrue to it by the voice of the Church, or under the pressure of circumstances, or by personal influence. It was an original institution in the Church, of Christ's creation, the same in the case of St. Paul as in that of the original Twelve. ¹

Gore points out that, according to St. Paul, "to be a trustworthy ambassador for God one needs 'apostolate'... and this apostolate, as he uses it, means not only inward sense of mission, but an external sending by Christ Himself". ² Thus, Gore avows that "'As my Father hath sent me, so I send you!' was the direct mission actual and unmistakable that was given to the Apostles including the Apostle Paul. ³

According to Gore, Christ's intention to send out the apostles was apparent early in His ministry. Therefore, he notes that Christ had "a special connection with the mission of the Twelve". ⁴ Christ trained them as "ministers" and "officers" of His kingdom. ⁵ They were "His weapons for the future which He was fashioning, tempering and polishing". ⁶

⁴ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 7.
⁵ Gore, Ministry of the Church, pp. 219 f.
They were to be witnesses,¹ stewards who distribute the bread of life,² and "rulers".³ To them was given the "keys of the kingdom".⁴ For this reason Gore points out that it is the apostles in Christ’s parable of the household who "are in the position of the 'faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord will set over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season'".⁵

The Principle of Apostolic Succession

Moreover, as has been indicated, Gore asserts that the ministry which was instituted by Christ in the persons of his apostles, was "intended plainly to endure to the end".⁶ It was an apostolate, "which was intended in some real sense to be permanent".⁷ And becoming explicit as to the method by which its permanency was to be preserved, Gore states: "Christ instituted in His Church, by succession from the Apostles a permanent ministry of truth and grace."⁸ Gore realizes, how-

¹ Ibid., p. 119.
² Gore, Ministry of the Church, pp. 221 f.
³ Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 13.
⁴ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 18.
⁶ Gore, Religion of the Church, pp. 68 f.
⁷ Ibid., Ministry of the Church, p. 231.
⁸ Ibid., p. 115.
ever, that as founders of the Church and as witnesses to Christ the apostolic office was unique. Yet his contention is that their office as stewards was to be perpetuated.

These Apostles must be supposed to have had a temporary function in their capacity of founders under Christ. In this capacity they held an office by its very nature not perpetual—the office of bearing the original witness of Christ's resurrection and making the original proclamation of the Gospel. But underlying this was another—a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries. This office instituted in their person was intended to become perpetual, and that by being transmitted from its first depositaries. It was thus intended that there should be in every Church, in each generation, an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ and a recognized power to transmit it, derived from above by apostolic descent.1

For Gore, Apostolic Succession occurs by the reception of authority from one who has received authority to transmit authority. He maintains: "There have always . . . existed in the Church ministers, who, besides the ordinary exercise of their ministry, possess the power of transmitting it . . . when they ordain men to the holy offices of the Church, they are only fulfilling the function entrusted to them out of the apostolic fount of authority."2 Further, the validity of all ministrations is dependent upon this principle.

... their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration, was to come

1 Ibid., pp. 69 f. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, pp. 139 f.

2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 74.
from above, in such sense that no ministerial act could be regarded as valid—that is, as having the security of the divine covenant about it—unless it was performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles.¹

This Core finds in accordance with the method of the transmission of the once given revelation of Christ through tradition. He asserts: "What breaks the tradition is heresy",² and: "What is heresy in the sphere of truth, a violation of apostolic succession is in the tradition of the ministry."³ In both the cases "there is a deposit handed down, an ecclesiastical trust transmitted".⁴

The church's doctrine of succession is thus of a piece with the whole idea of the Gospel revelation, as being the communication of a divine gift which must be received and cannot be originated,—received, moreover, through the channels of a visible and organic society...⁵

Consequently, for Core, apostolic succession is not only a corollary of the visible Church but "the principle of the succession in the ministry is even a necessary element in the idea of a visible church".⁶ It is in fact "the backbone of

¹ Ibid., p. 71.
² Ibid., p. 75.
³ Loc. cit.
⁴ Loc. cit.
⁵ Loc. cit.
⁶ Core, Religion of the Church, p. 71.
the Church".  

Hence, Gore, like the Tractarians from whom he inherited the doctrine, maintains that it is of the esse of the Church.  

Necessary to Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession is his declaration that the ministry is based on a sacramental principle, of "a sacramental conception". He maintains that "the ministry corresponds in principle to the Incarnation and the sacraments, and, indeed to the original creation of man". "In all these cases the material comes from below... But this material, which is of the earth, is each case assumed... by the Spirit from above." "Those who are to be ordained are, like the Levites, the offering of the people; but they receive, like Aaron and his sons, their consecration from above."  

As has been indicated in Chapter VII, the consecration of the ministry, i.e. ordination, is, for Gore, a sacrament.  

The act of ordination—the laying on of hands with accompanying of prayer or formula—was regarded as

4 Ibid., p. 71.
5 Loc. cit.
6 Ibid., p. 72.
sacramental and an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace thereby given.

As has been said, Gore maintains that after Pentecost the normal disposition of the Spirit was by the laying on of hands of an apostle or an apostolic delegate in both confirmation and ordination. In both the rites the bestowal of the Spirit is for a particular purpose, that of fulfilling a mission: in the case of the former, the mission of a member of the Church; in the case of the latter, the mission of the ministry of the Church. He points out that St. Paul reminds Timothy of the Spirit which is in him through the laying on of hands, and tells the presbyters at Ephesus that the Holy Ghost had made them bishops. Thus, Gore follows St. Paul in declaring


3 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 53. Cf. Chp. VII, ante p. 299. However, it will also be remembered that in his discussion of the sacraments, Gore indicates that once the Spirit is bestowed, i.e. at confirmation, it is no longer necessary for the member to call upon it as if he were not in possession of it. He does not correlate this with his avowal that there is a new bestowal at the time of ordination.

4 Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 107 f. Gore also states that the presbyters at Ephesus were doubtless outwardly appointed. Loc. cit.
that the ministry is ordained by "a special ministerial gift
or 'charisma'--a spirit of power and love and discipline":¹
imparted in the act of ordination by the laying on of hands.

However, being true to his historical information, Gore
admits that there seem to be instances when the laying on of
hands was not necessarily a bestowal of the Holy Spirit for
purposes of ordination.

It would appear as if in certain cases the outward
ceremony, whether baptism or the laying on of hands,
was only the recognition of a gift already received
and manifested by unmistakable signs. But even so
the outward ceremony was not omitted; and in other
cases the communication of the gift itself is attrib¬
uted to the outward ceremony.²

Thus, he explains the laying on of hands by the prophets and
teachers at Antioch upon Saul and Barnabas as the recognition
by the Church of the mission of the two apostles, since, at
least in the case of the Apostle Paul, Gore recognizes that
the mission came directly from Christ.³

Along with ordination being necessary for the ministry,
Gore maintains that the rite confers an "'indelible character'."⁴

¹ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 429; Gore cites II Tim.
1:6,7; also I Tim. 1:15, 4:14.

² Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 107; Gore cites Acts 10:46–

³ Ibid., p. 259. Gore does not
mention in this connection that at the appointment of Matthias
(Acts 1:21 ff.) there is no mention of any type of ordination
ceremony whatsoever.

⁴ Ibid., p. 187.
The church officer is ... a representative of God: his ordination has given him a divine commission and gift of grace; and as 'the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,' so from this point of view it is necessary to regard him who is once a priest as always a priest, whether he adorn his office or no.1

For Gore, this has such force as to admit of no re-ordination for a man once ordained.2 Consequently, "the sacrilegious ministry of the unworthiest priest is as valid as the ministry of the saint,"3 though Gore admits that it is a "monstrous anomaly".4 However, he also recognizes that in the early Church "the deposed priest was really regarded as a layman",5 but he does not make conclusions accordingly.

Hence, it is the sacrament per se that creates the ministry. And, as we shall see, it is only a succession of sacraments that is necessary to Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

Though Gore is insistent that the rite of ordination consecrates and empowers the minister in the Christian Church for his pastoral charge,6 he also maintains that the doctrine of

1 Ibid., pp. 187 f.
2 Cf. Ibid., pp. 189 ff.
3 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 168.
4 Loc. cit.
Apostolic Succession must be held concurrent with the democratic process of the election of the candidate for ordination by the people who he is going to serve. He states:

The democratic principle in the appointment to the ministry was very fully recognized in early times: the people, it was commonly agreed, should appoint the persons whom the bishops should ordain, and should choose the bishops themselves.¹

Thus, Gore explains: "The apostles ordained the first deacons but the Church elected them."²

So spoke the Apostles to the first Christians. "And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose seven men: whom they set before the Apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them."³

He points out that, according to Cyprian, the bishop for a particular community who is to be ordained by the neighboring bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people who have complete knowledge of him.⁴ And he quotes Leo the Great as stating: "'No reason can tolerate that persons should be held as bishops ... who are neither chosen by the clergy, nor demanded by the laity, nor ordained by the provincial bishops with the consent of the metropolitan.'⁵ Gore writes:

¹ Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 70.
² Ibid., p. 100.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 101 f., referring to Cyprian, Ep. lxvii. 5.
⁵ Ibid., p. 103, referring to Leo, Ep. x. 4-6; xiii. 3; xiv. 5; clxvii. 1.
It is hardly too much to say that the fathers and ordinals lay a stress on popular election or approbation of clergy hardly less marked than that which they lay on sacramental ordination.  

In line with his democratic ideals, Gore, according to Prestige, fostered a democratic spirit in the Community of the Resurrection. The Superior, who was Gore in the first years of the community's conception, was elected, and rather than being an abbot, he was merely a senior among brethren; the governing authority was committed to the chapter as a whole.

Much as Gore stresses the three-fold form of the ministry saying that "since apostolic days there have been always three orders of the ministry", he does not tie the principle of Apostolic Succession to any particular form. He asserts:

It is a matter of very great importance... to exalt the principle of the apostolic succession above the question of the exact form of the ministry, in which the principle has expressed itself, even though it be by apostolic ordering.

Hence, he attests that though monopiscopacy may be the best mode of Church government and may have been instituted by the apostles, it is not possible to maintain that the existence of

---


it is essential to the continuity of the Church.  

... nobody could maintain that the continuity of the Church would be broken if in any given diocese all the presbyters were consecrated to the episcopal office, and governed as a co-ordinate college of bishops without presbyters or presbyter-bishops.  

From this we see that the essence of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as Gore understands it is not the existence of any particular officer of the Church, but simply the existence of a personage who had been ordained with the power to ordain, one who can trace the lineage of this power back to the apostles. In other words, the doctrine does not necessarily comprise a succession of apostles, presbyter-bishops, bishops, or if it does, the persons involved are of a secondary note, but its essence, to use W. Telfer's phrase, is that of "an unbroken series of impositions of episcopal hands"; hence, a succession of consecrations.  

The basis for Gore's detachment of the monarchical office from the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is Jerome's witness to the effect that from the days of St. Mark the Evangelist down to the episcopates of Heraclitus and Dionysius, the

1 Ibid., p. 73.  
2 Loc. cit.  
presbyters at Alexandria appointed as a bishop one chosen out of their own number and placed him on a higher grade. From this evidence Gore deduces that Jerome seems to mean that in Alexandria no fresh consecration or ordination was required to make a presbyter a bishop but that he became such simply by virtue of election by the presbyters. "There would have been thus a substantial identity between the two orders." Gore also indicates that Eutychius seems to confirm Jerome's position, but he allows Eutychius' witness to bear little weight. Neither is Gore at all willing to allow Jerome's position to stand without question and tends to depreciate it on the basis of Origen's silence on the matter.

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 138. "Jerome's statement (Ep. cxlvi ad Evangelum) is as follows: 'Alexandriae a Marco evangelista usque ad Heracliam et Dionysium episcopos presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus imperatorum faciat aut diaconi eli gant de se quem industrium novem et archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?" Ibid., Appended Note B, p. 357.

2 Ibid., p. 138.


Dom Gregory Dix in his essay, "The Ministry in the Early Church", likewise distrusts Jerome's witness because of the silence of Clement and Origen. Dom Gregory Dix, "The Ministry in
However, although Gore does not elaborate on the subject, he does point out that a situation similar to the one in Alexandria described by Jerome existed for many centuries in the Celtic Church of Ireland, and that "something equivalent has been commonly believed in the West to have existed in the early church". He also mentions that, according to Epiphanius, Arius made no differentiation between presbyters and bishops, but he discredits the witness by stating that "his..."
original motive in formulating his anti-ecclesiastical views was apparently not a noble one."¹

But, as stated, for Gore, the doctrine of Apostolic Succession does not rest on the order of the ministry for all that is demanded is that those who ordain have the power, i.e. the authority, to do so. So that "when they ordain men to the holy offices of the Church, they are only fulfilling the function intrusted to them out of the apostolic fount of authority".² Hence, Gore asserts: "If the order of presbyters at any one time held the right to ordain, that was because it had been intrusted to them by apostolic men."³ Therefore, he maintains that if Jerome's report is accepted, the Alexandrian presbyters were within their rights in having appointed their own bishops because: "They were ordained, ex hypothesi, on the understand-

¹ Loc. cit., note 1. It would seem that the position of Arius should be worthy of more attention than Gore gives it, for although Arius was justly condemned a heretic on Christological grounds, it would seem strange if he held the essential identity between presbyters and bishops, a matter which is easily verified, if there had not been historical precedent for doing so.

Gore also makes reference to the author of the Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, commonly called Ambrosiaster and the author of some questions on the Old and New Testaments who was probably a presbyter in Rome: both, according to Gore, writing during Damasus' episcopate at Rome, and both minimizing the episcopate. However, Gore does not consider their evidence. Ibid., p. 171.

² Ibid., p. 74.

³ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 31. Further: "It no more disturbs the principle of apostolic succession than if your Lordship ordained all the presbyters in his diocese to-day to episcopal functions." Loc. cit.
ing that under certain circumstances they might be called, by simple election, to execute the bishop's office.\(^1\) They were, Gore avows, "bishops in posse".\(^2\) Hence, he asserts that while "elsewhere there were two distinct ordinations, the one making a bishop and another a presbyter; at Alexandria there was only one ordination, which made a man a presbyter and a potential bishop".\(^3\)

Gore's anxiety not only maintain doubt as to the validity of Jerome's report, but to assert that if Jerome's evidence is accepted then all the presbyters must be considered "bishops in posse" all having been ordained \textit{ex hypothesi} stems directly from the fact, as \textit{a}, Telfer points out, that in the Alexandrian situation, "Gore saw clearly what were the consequences as touching the nature of valid episcopal succession".\(^4\) For, if the presbyters at Alexandria not only elected but consecrated their bishops as Telfer avows,\(^5\) then the idea of Apostolic Succession as Gore construes it, \textit{a succession of consecrations},\(^6\) can no longer be held.

\(^1\) Gore, \textit{Ministry of the Church}, p. 143.
\(^2\) \textit{Loc. cit.}
\(^3\) \textit{Loc. cit.}
\(^4\) Telfer, "Episcopal Succession in Egypt", \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1.
\(^6\) \textit{Cf. ante} p. 349. Hence, it would seem that the results
Holding to his belief in Apostolic Succession, Gore criticizes presbyters in the sixteenth or subsequent centuries who ordained other presbyters. "They were taking on themselves an office which, beyond all question, they had not received—which was not imparted to them in their ordination."1 Gore maintains that the Reformation was a rebellion against the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.2 "Undoubtedly there lay at the root of the whole Reformation movement the denial of the principle of the succession."3

Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin are at one in basing the church upon the preaching of the pure word of God, which they could not find in 'the Pope's church': and in repudiating with contempt the idea that the power to ordain pastors for the true church of Christ depended upon succession to the officers—whether bishops or priests—of that communion of which Calvin said, 'the form of the legitimate church is not to be found either in any one of their congregations or in the body at large.4

Gore, therefore, maintains that the reformers repudiated both "a law of divine authority in the church" as well as "an essen-

---

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 31 f.
2 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 170.
tial principle of the church's continuous life".¹

However, as already indicated, Gore is not so definite in his criticism of the "Protestant" churches as to deny that the Holy Spirit has been present in them.

To deny God's presence with them, and His co-operation in their work and ministry, would seem to me to approach to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. We cannot express in words too strong our assurance that God has been with them, and that we are meant to learn from their saints and teachers, and to sit at their feet as before those who possess God's spirit.

And if I am asked how I can explain this on my own principles, which compel me to regard them as rebels against a divine law, I would answer that they were not only rebels against a divine law: they were vigorously and bravely vindicating divine principles at the same time. And the principles which they were vindicating, especially the principle of the supremacy of Scripture in the church against the corruption of tradition, and the principle of human liberty against spiritual tyranny, are such divine principles—are principles so certainly Christian—that when the vindication of these principles carried them on, in some cases regretfully and under the pathetic plea of necessity, even to the neglect of a fundamental and divine law of Christian fellowship, the apostolic succession, I cannot even so forget what they were vindicating.²

Hence, as in the sacraments, the question of ordination, for Gore, is one of order, not of exclusive grace.³ In fact, he states that "God has been pleased to work with a full measure

¹ Ibid., p. 184.
² Ibid., pp. 184 f.
of His grace far beyond all normal channels and laws of validity. But, Gore's position on the matter is that though God is not restricted by His covenant—"Deus non obligatur sacramentis suis"—man has no right to go outside the bounds of security of it.

If Gore criticizes the stand of the "Protestant" Churches, he is pleased with the position of his own communion.

The English Church had a serious mind to continue the old orders in the Reformed Church; for their continuance she provided a proper minister, and proper rite, valid in matter and form.

He points out that the Church of England, though it requires that its ministry should be authorized by Apostolic Succession, does not require "any exact or explicit expression of belief in regard to it." Gore bases the validity of the Anglican succession on that of Matthew Parker, who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559, and states: "If our episcopate

1 Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 171.

2 Gore, Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures, p. 15. Cf. Chp. VII ante, pp. 204 ff.

3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 110.

4 Charles Gore, Roman Catholic Claims (Seventh Edition; London: Longman's, Green, and Co., 1900), p. 158.

5 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 52. This position would seem to make the doctrine a matter of pure protection if not divine fiat rather than being a matter of divine endowment, a position contrary to Gore's own general interpretation of the sacraments. Cf. Chp. VII, ante pp. 292 ff. It is to K. E. Kirk's credit that he rejects this noncomittal attitude as an absurdity. Kirk, ed., op. cit., p. 3.

6 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, pp. 141 f.
is questioned, so was St. Paul's apostolate, and we need not be more ashamed to defend ourselves than he was.\footnote{Ibid., p. 141. Gore also indicates that there exists a school of Presbyterian theologians who apparently seek to maintain the principle of Apostolic Succession. They hold that the power of ordination rests with the presbyter as well as with the bishop and may be exercised by him. Thus, they would maintain that succession has been maintained in the Presbyterian churches. Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 180, referring to Dr. Cooper and others, The Pentecostal Gift, (Maclehose, 1906), pp. 165, 166, 173 ff., 178 ff., 195.}

The Function of the Ministry

As the Church has prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions, these functions are carried through its ministry. In fact, Gore avows that it is through the persons of the apostles [the ministry of the Church] that Christ sent the Church on its prophetic, priestly and kingly mission.\footnote{Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 5 f.} However, Gore points out that the ministers of the Church are prophets, priests, and kings "not in separation from the general body of the faithful, but as organs of its common life".\footnote{Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 155.} He follows Dr. Lightfoot in stating: "The difference between clergy and laity 'is not a difference in kind' but in function."\footnote{Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 84, quoting from Dr. Lightfoot, Dissert. on the Christian Ministry, p. 181.}

In reference to the Prophetic Office of the Ministry, i.e. the teaching office, Gore points out that the office of the
normal pastor in the Church is an office of maintaining, propagating, and guarding the common tradition of the faith.¹ He asserts that in the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul gives a lofty conception of his teaching office;² he calls the local presbyter-bishops, "'pastors or teachers'".³ Again, St. Paul exhorts Timothy to choose men "'apt to teach'".⁴ Further, Gore asserts that in the New Testament there were prophets associated with the apostles whose duty it was to teach, but these, he maintains, had no official rank.⁵ The function of the teaching "chair" of the prophets, according to Gore, passed first to the presbyter-bishops in each local church⁶ and then to the bishops.⁷

In the context of referring to the Priestly Office of the Ministry, Gore first indicates agreement with Dr. Denny, who, he asserts, maintains that in the New Testament there is not

¹ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 156.
² Ibid., p. 154.
³ Ibid., p. 155, referring to Eph. 4:11.
⁴ Loc. cit., referring to I Tim. 3:2.
⁵ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 234.
⁶ Ibid., p. 243.
⁷ Ibid., p. 234. Here Gore is using the term "bishop" in the later sense of the term as opposed to "presbyter-bishop". He also points out that "the high-priesthood ascribed by Hippolytus to the bishops (def. Omn. Haer. prooem.) seems to be especially connected with teaching authority". Loc. cit., Note 2.
any trace of a Christian priest making sacrifice for sin or mediating between God and man.\footnote{1}{Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 159, citing Hastings Dig. of Bible, iv. 100, s. v. PALEST.} However, it will be remembered that Gore calls the Church "a kingdom of priests", which makes use of the reconciliation of Christ. He maintains that the whole body is priestly.\footnote{2}{Ibid., p. 160.} Hence, as has been indicated, Gore asserts that, according to the New Testament, "the church was continually exercising its priesthood: offering up spiritual sacrifices, absolving or retaining sins, receiving or imparting spiritual gifts",\footnote{3}{Charles Gore, Christ and Society (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1929), p. 86. Cf. Chp. VII, ante pp. 252 f.} as well as by celebrating the Eucharist, which Gore avows was regarded as "the church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving".\footnote{4}{Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 160.} However, Gore maintains that, in that the Church exercised its priesthood by acting through its appointed officers; therefore, these can be legitimately called priests, though this was first done in the second century.\footnote{5}{Ibid., p. 162. Cf. Chp. VII, ante p. 333.} \footnote{6}{Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 160. Gore indicates that, according to Origen, the priesthood is propounded after the analogy of the Mosaic. Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 155, referring to Origen, in LEVIT. V. 3. Again, he states: "the title not at first applied to the ministers of the church is
Gore blames the hesitation which the Church displayed in naming the early Christian ministry "priests" on the fact of the bad connotation given the term by Jewish and Pagan associations. Nevertheless in that, according to Gore, the Church applied and used Christ's priesthood and reconciliation, he holds that the apostolic ministry was "a 'ministry of reconciliation'". Therefore, the Christian ministry involves "the principle of priesthood whether the Greek word hiereus is used for them or no". Gore writes:

"We must conclude that when once it was established that Christ was a priest—the great High Priest, and His church a priestly body, it became inevitable and right that the ordained officers of that body should be called priests."

However, Gore is well aware that there is a "false sort of 'sacerdotalism'", which comes about by the transference to the Greek term ἱερεύς and the Latin sacerdos. (The English word, 'priest' is of course derived from 'presbyter', an original title of the Christian ministry.) But the words ἀρτουππηρησ which are used of the Christian ministry in the New Testament (Acts 13:2, Rom. 15:16), are technical words for priestly ministry, both Jewish and Pagan." Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 160, note 1.

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 161.
2 Ibid., p. 162.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 138.
6 Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 95.
the clergy alone of duties and responsibilities which ought to belong to the whole Church.\footnote{1} He insists that the ministry does not stand "between the soul and God";\footnote{2} there is "the equal freedom of approach of God belonging to all those who share the same Spirit".\footnote{3} Further, there is no restriction of knowledge of the truth or responsibility for truth to any particular class.\footnote{4} Thus: "The priesthood of the Christian ministry is a representative, not a vicarious priesthood."\footnote{5}

\footnote{1} Ibid., p. 96. Gore states: "Care for Christian truth, care for religious education and training, care for Christian worship, care for Christian holiness, these things ought not to be left to the clergy. They belong to the whole Church—the whole body of the faithful. And if the clergy wear a solemn dress in the public worship, that is a mark, not of the dignity of their own order, but the dignity of the priestly body which is the whole Church in all its grades." \textit{Loc. cit.}

\footnote{2} Gore, \textit{Religion of the Church}, p. 177.

\footnote{3} Gore, \textit{Holy Spirit and the Church}, p. 138.


\footnote{5} Gore, \textit{Holy Spirit and the Church}, p. 138. Gore contends that "the bishops were first called priests; and gradually the term was applied to the presbyters also". Gore, \textit{Orders and Unity}, p. 163. It is worthwhile to notice that even in the Community of the Resurrection, which Gore founded while at Pusey House, the idea of priesthood \textit{per se} was de-emphasized as long as Gore was in control. Prestige reports: "The Community itself remained deliberately unobtrusive. Its members wore no religious habit except the cassock, the official dress of any Anglican clergyman. Nor did they use the title of Father, which only became customary some years later. Gore himself was never known as Father Gore.

In his book, \textit{The Apostolic Succession}, A. Ehrhardt, rejecting the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as having been originally held in the Church, indicates an astounding dependence of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession on the Jewish idea of
It is in this context that Gore speaks of "a distinction of functions within the ministry", which he contends appears from the first.¹ In apostolic times this distinction was that of "apostles", "presbyter-bishops", and "deacons"; later, it was that of "bishops", "presbyters", and "deacons".² It is the distinction between "bishop" and "presbyter" with which Gore is most concerned. According to Gore, the "plentitude of the priesthood is in every bishop, and in every bishop equally".³ For the meaning of the term, plentitude, Gore first of all follows Cyprian maintaining that the bishop in each community is the "symbol", "guardian", and "instrument" of unity.⁴ Gore contends: "It must be recognized that the one main link of unity has been in fact the apostolic succession of the min-

priestly succession. He points out that Hegesippus whose lists of bishops are headed by St. James of Jerusalem "saw in St. James the true successor of the High Priest", (Ehrhardt, op. cit., p. 64) and that "the Priesthood was at the root of the Apostolic succession". Ibid., p. 81. "The doctrine owed its emphasis to the necessity of continuing the sacerdotal ministry of the Old Israel within the New Israel, the church." Ibid., p. 82. If this is true, and Ehrhardt's evidence is certainly worthy of serious consideration, it would seem that the next question which must be asked is whether it is legitimate to designate Christian ministers as "priests".

¹ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 162. Cf. Gore, Religion of the Church, p. 70.


³ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 167.

⁴ Ibid., p. 166, quoting Cyprian Ep. xliii. 3; de Unit. Eccles. 14.
"Continuity of doctrine is a great thing; but it is not enough. There must also be a continuity of persons."

A visible society which because it is diffused throughout the world, lacks all the links of fellowship which belonged to a nation, must have links of its own; and one of the chief of these was, in fact, a ministry, proceeding down the generations by succession from the apostolic fount, and taking shape in a hierarchy of bishops, presbyters, and deacons in each local church.

Hence:

Granted this apostolic succession, there is guaranteed in the Church as a whole, and in each local church, a perpetual stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, a perpetual stewardship which, at the same time, acts as the link of continuity, binding the churches of all ages and of all nations into visible unity with the apostolic college.

---

1 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 168.
3 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 300.
4 Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 10 f. Cf. Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 147; Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 76; Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 171. "The ministry is of divine appointment," and we have no right to tamper with it. Do we not see what havoc has been wrought by men ignoring its value, and so splitting off into a thousand sects? For the apostolic succession of the ministry was intended to be one of the main pledges for the maintenance of the unity of the body." Gore, Creed of the Christian, p. 95. Cf. Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 186 f. However, Gore also maintains that the 'one faith' in the three-fold name of God and in the Incarnation was the main connecting link or basis of union both according to the New Testament documents and the epistles of Ignatius and Clement. Charles Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God (London: John Murray, 1891), p. 84. For a fuller discussion of Gore's concept of the unity of the Church cf. Chap. VI, ante pp. 259 ff.
Basic to the "plentitude of the priesthood", for Gore, is the bishop's power to ordain. In fact, the real distinction in the ministry is that between those who have the power to ordain and those who do not. It is on the sacramental authority of those possessing such power that the existence of the Church depends. Quoting Cyprian, Gore writes:

... 'the bishops, who succeed to the Apostles by an ordination which makes them their representatives,' are the possessors of that sacerdotal authority and grace with which Christ endowed his church, and which is necessary for her existence. ¹

Thus, though Gore admits, as has been indicated, that there is some question as to "whether the undoubted distinction of bishops and presbyters in the Church tradition was originally of divine or only of ecclesiastical authority",² he tends to overlook this uncertainty when speaking of the right of ordination. Hence, he asserts, as he is certain Ignatius asserted, that the bishops are "clothed with that monarchical authority which had belonged to the Apostles, but never to the presbyters".³ He points to the instance of the laying on of hands of the seven in Acts as an example of the

¹ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 166, quoting Cyprian, Ep. lxvi. 8.


³ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 304, citing Ignatius ad. Rom. 4; cf. ad. Thrall. 3; ad. Philad. 5.
apostles' exclusive power of ordination.1 Thus: "Only the apostle, or perhaps also the prophet can lay on hands or give the gift of the Holy Ghost."2

The laying-on of hands in ordination is, as we should gather from the Acts and Pastoral Epistles taken together, a determination of this same divine gift to a special ministerial function, or the bestowal of a superadded power. Further we are led to believe that this function of the laying-on of hands belonged exclusively to the Apostles, with those 'prophets and teachers' who seem to have been associated in their apostolic office.3

Hence, ordination is a sacrament which conveys the gift of the Holy Ghost, i.e. the grace necessary to perpetuate the ministry on which the Church is dependent for its existence.4 In that the administration of this sacrament is limited to the order of bishops, Gore's thinking in this matter results in a legalistic position wherein the activity of Christ to perpetuate His Church in history through the Holy Spirit is limited by a succession of men whose only qualification need be that

1 Ibid., pp. 256 f., referring to Acts 6:6.

2 Ibid., p. 203.

3 Ibid., p. 258. Cf. Loc. cit., note 2 where Gore states: "It is presumable that the men who could lay-on hands in Acts xiii. 1-3 could also do so for the ordinary purpose of 'confirmation.' Otherwise, Acts viii. 17-19 implies the limitation of this function to the Apostles."

In this connection T. F. Torrance states: "The highest order, the fullest order, is that ordained to the celebration of the Eucharist." T. F. Torrance, Royal Priesthood Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 3 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1955), p. 78.

4 Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 70. Cf. ante pp. 343 ff.
they were ordained with the power to ordain, by which power they are instruments in the perpetuating of the succession of consecrations necessary to the existence of the Church. ¹

Thus, the reasoning behind Gore's maintenance that Apostolic Succession is of the essence of the Church is easily followed. The ministry is "an indispensable part"² of the Church which Christ instituted and "there belongs to the order of Bishops, and to them alone the power to perpetuate the ministry in its several grades, by the transmission of the authority received from the apostles".³ Hence, it is really only the order of bishops that is indispensable. Therefore, we find in Gore that not only is the Church dependent on the ministry, but that the lower grades of the ministry are dependent on that order possessing Apostolic Succession. Thus, Gore has what may be called a primary and a dependent ministry as well as a de-

¹ This is quite irreconcilable with Gore's contention that the sacraments are not of the quality of divine fiat (Cf. Chap. VII, ante pp. 232 ff.) but it is consistent with endowing the sacrament of ordination with an indelible character. Cf. ante pp. 346 f. Hence, in spite of the fact that Gore's whole doctrine of the Church is bound up with morality, (Cf. Chap. IV, ante p. 190; Chap. V, ante pp. 225 ff.; Chap. VI, ante pp. 233 ff., 252 ff., 290 ff.) and even though he mentions that Irenaeus qualifies those who succeed from the apostles as maintaining "a sound and unreproachable mode of life and incorruptness of speech!", (Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 125) his own doctrine of the ministry in general and of Apostolic Succession in particular has no moral qualifications. Cf. ante p. 346.

² Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 115.

³ Loc. cit.
The dependence of the Church on the apostolic ministry comes to a still sharper focus in Gore's discussion of it in connection with the administration of the sacraments. In the sub-apostolic period, Gore points out, not only were the bishops the maintainers of the tradition of sound words but that the administration of the sacraments was in their hands. Therefore: "The Christian must receive from no hands but theirs or their delegates' the indispensable food, and join in no Eucharist of which they were not the leaders." 

Speaking of the ministry in relation to the Eucharist, Gore states:

It is the hand which offers and distributes; it is the voice which consecrates and pleads. And the whole body can no more dispense with its services than the natural body can grasp or speak without the instrumentality of hand and tongue.

Hence, the Church is dependent upon the ministry because its members are dependent upon the sacraments for which the ministry is necessary.

The individual life can receive ... fellowship with God only through membership in the one body and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution,—of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments.

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 145.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 86.
4 Ibid., p. 94.
As men, Gore points out, we are bound to those administrations which are "valid". And, for Gore, a valid sacrament, as for the Tractarians, depends on a valid ministry. Hence, Gore agrees with what he maintains represents the common doctrine that "only a priest can offer or consecrate the Eucharist, as only a bishop can ordain". In reference to the minister of the sacrament of Baptism, Gore is not so exacting, maintaining that though the priest is the "proper minister" of Baptism, Baptism by any baptized individual is allowed.

The 'Kingly Office of the Ministry is, according to Gore, implied in the phrase, "shepherding the sheep", which he maintains "is the regular word for ruling". Though Gore avows: "It is a ruling which is also a feeding", he also contends that this capacity, which is co-ordinate with the kingly office of the church in general, involves discipline. Gore declares:

1 Ibid., pp. 110 f.
3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 202. Gore admits that Tertullian gives evidence that a layman could both baptize and consecrate the Eucharist, (Ibid., p. 204) but he holds that this cannot be accepted as illustrating the mind of the Church.
4 Ibid., pp. 206 f.
5 Ibid., p. 49.
that the whole Church has the duty of discipline and, therefore, St. Paul calls upon the Church at Corinth to excommunicate the incestuous man as well as speaking of punishment upon a member as having been "inflicted by the majority." Thus, though he maintains that the disciplinary authority, "the authority to bind and loose," inheres in the Church as a whole, Gore asserts: "The church has (not by her own but by Christ's authority) executive officers, and it is through them that her judicial power is put into effect." At first this disciplinary function was, according to Gore, the business of the general clergy, later of the local.

The apostolic legate, like the apostles, exercises discipline over all the members of the church, including the local clergy; and this full function passed to the bishops in each church; but both in apostolic days and for centuries after the laity were associated in the work of discipline.

The Form and Function of the Ministry
in Relation to Development

Though, as has been said, Gore holds that the canon of Scripture is part of the same formative growth with the creeds

---

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 166 f., referring to I Cor. 5:13, II Cor. 2:6.
2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 225.
3 Ibid., p. 226.
and episcopal successions and rests on the same authority,\(^1\) he, nevertheless, holds to the finality of Scripture as far as doctrine is concerned. Gore asserts: "Certainly it remains true that nothing in the ancient or undivided church has ever been made an article of faith . . . which is not to be found plainly in the Scripture."\(^2\) Hence, he proclaims that the original Gospel recorded in the New Testament is "infallible",\(^3\) and that the Church may explicate "but it cannot add to it".\(^4\) Therefore, Gore writes that the test of doctrinal development must be that "what it asserts shall be really found implicit at least in Scripture".\(^5\) They are the "sole final testing ground for dogmatic requirement".\(^6\) On this ground he criticizes the Roman communion for rejecting this criterion—for repudiating the canon that nothing should be accepted as part of faith which is "either contrary to or over and above 'what had been written'".\(^7\)

---


2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, Note B, p. 281.

3 Ibid., p. 199.

4 Loc. cit.

5 Ibid., p. 224.


7 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 208.
Following this line of thought, Gore maintains that questions in reference to creed and Church, sacraments and ministry are to be answered by laying aside traditional assumptions and asking the question: "What is the mind of Christ concerning the propagation of His religion?" which mind he holds is to be found in the New Testament documents.

Nevertheless, Gore maintains that the New Testament is not conclusive in regard to the form of the ministry.

What we do not get, then, is a distinct instruction as to what form the ministry was to take. Were the local bishops to receive additional powers, such as would make them independent of any higher order? Or were the apostles and apostolic men, like Timothy and Titus, to perpetuate their distinct order? and, if so, was it to be perpetuated as a localized or as a general order? These questions are still open.

Further, Gore asserts: "It must be admitted that if the documents of the New Testament stood alone . . . we should feel the various tendencies toward different kinds of organization were at work in the Christian Church, that the picture presented was confused, and that no decisive conclusion as to the form of the Christian ministry could be reached." "The history of the way in which the ministry of the later church emerged out

---

2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. x.
3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 270.
of the apostolic ministry cannot be exactly traced. However, Gore declares that the New Testament documents are only some of the documents which belong to the history of the Church, and therefore: "The earliest history must be interpreted in the light of what emerged from it as the regular and universally accepted order." In other words, Gore holds that "the authority of the church determines the form of the ministry".

But the authority of the Church also determines the function of the ministry.

It may well have been left for the church to decide, according to the wisdom given to it, as to the precise allocation of functions. Its decision, as the New Testament would have us believe, would have heavenly sanction. Thus, in fact, it was the decision of the church, early, unanimous and final, that only a bishop can validly ordain, and only a presbyter celebrate the eucharist.

Thus, we see that Gore in his determination to assert the legitimacy of the three-fold form of the ministry and his theory that only a bishop can ordain, has left the New Testament standard behind and adopted the canon of Church authority to main-

---

1 Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 70.
2 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 83.
3 loc. cit.
4 loc. cit.
5 Ibid., p. 163.
tain his opinions on the form and function of the ministry.

This would seem to controvert Gore's own proclamations as to the absolute dependence of dogmatic requirement upon the Scriptures as well as his contentions by which he rejects Newman's ideas of development as represented in Newman's Essays on the Development of Doctrine. Gore maintains that development is not necessarily a justified development.¹ Further:

The appeal to a particular moment of Christian development as having any degree of finality seems to me, intellectually, morally, and religiously, to be doing precisely the very thing which is subversive of the whole foundation upon which our claim to reform ourselves, without losing Catholicity, has stood.²

Therefore, Gore avows that there is no reason to be bound to the theological opinions of the thirteenth century or any other period.³ "The appeal to Scripture is paramount."⁴

However, if we take Gore's theory of development at face value, allowing that the form and function of the ministry is a matter of Church authority, it would see that he would have difficulty maintaining either the doctrine of Apostolic Success-

² Ibid., p. 33.
³ Ibid., p. 34.
⁴ Ibid., p. 24. However, the fact that Gore asserts that true development is "reversion to type: the continual appeal to antiquity and Scripture (Ibid., p. 36) indicates that he is not really willing to let Scripture stand as the authority.
sion as the esse of the Church or the doctrine as such which depends on the principle that only those ordained to ordain are able to ordain. If the Church has the prerogative of deciding the function of the ministry then it would seem it must follow that the Church is primary and the ministry secondary. If so, the Church's being could hardly be said to depend on an essential ministry defined in terms of the ability to ordain, for the Church can determine who is to administer the rite of ordination. Again, it would seem that if the Church has the authority to allocate the functions of its clergy, then as it at one time decided that only a bishop could ordain and a presbyter celebrate the Eucharist, at another period in history it could decide the power of ordination rested in all its presbyters or in the congregations themselves. In other words, if the question of order is a matter of Church decision, as Gore avows, then it can hardly be held that any particular decision regarding Church order occupies a position so eminent and with such authority that it must be followed for all time.

Thus, we see that in attempting to provide assurance for his doctrine of Apostolic Succession from the witness of the developments of Church history, (on which witness Gore bases his doctrine)1 Gore subscribes to a line of thought which, when

followed to its conclusions, destroys the doctrine itself. 1

With this, of course, Gore's criticism of the presbyters of the sixteenth and later centuries for assuming a power outside their jurisdiction must lose its force. To repeat: if the function of the ministry is a matter of Church decision, the Church could legitimately allocate the function of ordination to the presbyters, as easily as it had once restricted it to bishops. Indeed, it would seem that the Apostle Paul when reminding Timothy of the gift that was in him by the laying on of hands of the *apostoltepo* (I Tim. 4:14) was quite convinced that presbyters or elders originally were endowed with the power of ordination, a power, if Jerome's witness can be

1 Again, considering his theory of development, it is difficult to understand how Gore can legitimately criticize the Roman conception of the papacy on the grounds that it did not belong to catholic tradition from the first, (Charles Gore, The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1925), p. 31) that there was no centralization in the early conception of authority, (Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 202) or that the "Pauline and Augustinian idea of church unity excludes . . . the Roman method of arguing for the Papacy from the necessity that a body must have a head". Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 155. At the same time, while admitting that the modern Anglican or Roman type of bishop does not represent the original type, Gore asserts that "we need not necessarily deplore the change". Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 106. However, Gore's arguments against the Papacy on the grounds that it was never accepted by the Eastern Church (Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 196) would seem to be quite legitimate. In an earlier opinion Gore went so far as to say of the Papacy: "There must have been something providential in its growth, however much the purpose of Providence may still be found to be thwarted and misdirected by human ambition and human deception." Charles Gore, Leo the Great (London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1880), p. 95.
taken seriously, which they retained at Alexandria at least well into the third century. If so, it would seem that the presbyters of the sixteenth and later centuries were again endowed with an authority that had originally belonged to their office.

Again, Gore is certain that the power of ordination rests with the Holy Spirit. He points out that, according to the Apostle Paul, it was the power of the Holy Spirit that ordained the Corinthian presbyters (Acts 20:28).\(^1\) Would it not follow that the same Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the living God, which Gore insists is present in the "Protestant" Churches\(^2\) is sufficient to ordain a valid ministry in all communions where He is present today?

---

1 Cf. ante p. 344; Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 160.
2 Cf. ante p. 355.
CHAPTER IX

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MINISTRY

AS THE WITNESS TO APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

In the preface to his publication, The Ministry of the Christian Church, Gore makes it plain that the book is "an 'apology' for the principle of Apostolic Succession". It is, therefore, his opus magnum on the subject and the main source for our discussion in this chapter.

In beginning his argument Gore, in his honesty, admits that he presupposes the principle of Apostolic Succession. He proposes to prove that the principle has always been integral to the Church from its conception by examining and putting forth the relevant data from the historical, New Testament, and sub-apostolic witness. Gore's arrangement of his material


2 In 1920 Gore claimed of this work: "I dare to claim that I presented in one volume all the ascertainable evidence and sought to give each piece of it its true value in the light of the whole." Charles Gore, Dr. Headlam's Hampton Lectures (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1920), p. 4. In Orders and Unity, Gore largely repeats his argument in a shortened form.

3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, pp. 69 f.

4 Gore maintains that this is the way we actually arrive at convictions. "We do not start afresh, we take the traditional belief, the traditional position and test it. . . . If the traditional belief will not bear the light of facts, it
corresponds to the fact that he presupposes the doctrine which he intends to prove. He begins where he feels certain of his ground, basing his argument on the testimony of Irenaeus. ¹

The Historical Witness

According to Gore, Irenaeus "rests his case in the main on the historical revelation". ² His security is in "the tradition". ³

He regards the bishops in every Church as succeeding in an especial sense to the apostles. They represent in every place by apostolic succession the catholic faith; they have the 'gift of truth' and the apostolic authority of government . . . ⁴

Not only does Irenaeus base his argument in tradition, but, Gore points out: "It is mainly as preserving the catholic tradition that Irenaeus regards the apostolic succession." ⁵

Gore illustrates this contention by quoting from Irenaeus:

has to be modified or reversed; we have to go through a process of . . . 'the correction of our premises.' But we gave, and rightly gave, a prerogative to an accepted position, so far at least as to start from it." ¹¹bid., p. 65.

1 ¹Ibid., p. 116.
2 ¹Ibid., p. 119.
3 ¹Loc. cit.
4 ¹¹bid., p. 120. Gore quotes from Irenaeus as follows: "'Charisma veritatis certum!' (iv. 26. 2); "'quos et successores [apostoli] relinquebant suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes!'" (iii. 3. 1). ¹Loc. cit., note 1.
appeal against the Gnostics:

"All who wish to see the truth have it in their power to fix their eyes on the tradition of the Apostles, which is manifested in all the world; and we can recount the number of those, who were appointed by the Apostles as bishops in the Churches, and their successors down to our own time . . . "

Further, Gore declares that Irenaeus fortifies his argument by listing the succession at Rome from Peter and Paul down to Eleutherus in his own day. Thus, according to Irenaeus, "there has come down to us with the same order and the same succession the tradition from the Apostles in the church and the preaching of the truth."  

"We must obey those who are the elders in the Church, those who, as we have shown, have the succession from the Apostles; who, with the succession of the episcopate, have received also the sure gift of truth according to the will of the Father: but as for the rest, who leave the original succession and come together wherever it may be, then we must hold in suspicion, whether as heretics of wrong opinion, or as men who make divisions through pride and self-pleasing, again ashypocrites."

With this, Gore avows: "The position of Irenaeus is thus very

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 123, quoting Irenaeus, iii. 3. 1-3.
2 loc. cit.
3 Ibid., pp. 123 f., quoting Irenaeus, iii. 3. 1-3.
4 Ibid., p. 124, quoting Irenaeus, iii. 3. 4.
clear and definite."\(^1\)

Next, Gore points to Tertullian maintaining that he both accepts and propagates the doctrine of Irenaeus, his teacher. Tertullian discloses his position in the matter by saying in his *Praescriptiones* (Preliminary Pleas) against the Gnostic teachers:

"Let them produce the account of the origins of their Churches, let them unroll the line of their bishops, running down in such a way from the beginning that their first bishop shall be had for his authorizer and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of the apostolic men who continued to the end of their fellowship."\(^2\)

Gore asserts that Tertullian challenges his readers to make it their business to become acquainted with what the churches having the "very chairs of the apostles"—Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and Rome, "have learnt and taught".\(^3\)

Hence, Gore states: "The unchanging tradition goes hand in hand with the steadfastness of ministerial succession."\(^4\)

From here Gore moves forward to reinforce Irenaeus' pos-

---


4 *Loc. cit.*
tion by reference to the succession lists of Hegesippus1 as preserved by Eusebius.2 These witness to the fact that previous to Irenaeus there were, as Hegesippus had found, "a succession in each city".3 From this evidence Gore avows: "Starting thus from about the middle of the second century, the episcopal succession is an undoubted fact in all known Christian churches."4

As already discussed, Gore runs into difficulty holding episcopal succession at Alexandria in the face of Jerome's testimony that the presbyters appointed one of themselves as bishop.5 He cites a letter of Hadrian who visited Alexandria in A.D. 130 to Servianus in which, according to Gore, Hadrian "recognized the 'bishops of Christ' as distinct figures from Christian presbyters",6 and he depreciates Jerome's evidence

---

1 In these, Hegesippus, according to Gore, is speaking of a journey to the West made not later than A.D. 167. Ibid., p. 127.
3 Ibid., p. 128.
4 Loc. cit. However, if Ehrhardt is correct in showing that Irenaeus based his doctrine on the succession lists of Hegesippus this argument for the reinforcement of Irenaeus' position must be set aside. Ehrhardt, op. cit., pp. 107 ff.
on the basis of the silence both of Epiphanius, Jerome's older contemporary and bishop of Salamis in Cyprus,¹ and Origen on the matter.² At any rate, as has been explained, even if Jerome's testimony is accepted in the way Gore is willing to accept it, i.e. that all presbyters were ordained as bishops, it does not invalidate Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession³ though even then it certainly discredits any belief in the intimacy which Gore finds a between the three-fold form of the ministry and the doctrine.

The state of things, then, which is assumed to have existed at Alexandria violates the complete uniformity of the church ministry in the period we are considering—it requires us to introduce qualifications into our generalization of results—but it does not affect the principle.⁴

The next testimony of import that Gore comes to is the

---

¹ Ibid., p. 138, referring to Epiphanius, Haer. lxix. 1.
² Ibid., pp. 140 ff.
³ Cf. Loc. cit. As has been indicated, if W. Telfer is correct, it would seem that the Alexandrian situation does invalidate Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Cf. Chap. VIII, ante, p. 353.
⁴ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 144. It would seem that if Gore was not predisposed to believe that the situation at Alexandria, as described by Jerome, was exceptional, he would not have such high regard for Origen's silence; i.e. if he held as does, for instance, Lightfoot, whose position, according to Gore, was that the thing which Jerome was describing was the typical method of appointing bishops, which later gave way to bishops being consecrated by the bishops, (Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 129) Origen's silence on the matter would seem quite normal. Gore also mentions, but only mentions, that "there is independent evidence of this tradition [i.e. as described by Jerome] existing in Egypt in the sixth century". Ibid., p. 129.
saying of Epiphanius which indicates a separation of powers between bishop and presbyter. Gore quotes Epiphanius as maintaining that "while presbyters could beget children to the church, i.e. by baptism, only bishops could beget fathers to the church, i.e. by ordination." 1

Gore then points out Cyprian as one who "stands out prominently among the western writers who vindicated the claim of the apostolic ministry". 2 However, Gore also avows: "It cannot be rightly maintained that he [Cyprian] added anything new to the belief of his predecessors in the visible unity of the Church or the authority of the episcopate". 3 Still, Gore holds, Cyprian certainly emphasizes both episcopacy and Apostolic Succession in its relation to Church unity. "He gave emphatic expression to an existing church principle in view of the particular circumstances of his episcopate." 4 In that Cyprian was largely concerned with the problem of Church unity, 5 he asserts

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 159, referring to Epiphanius,Adv. Haer. lxxv. 4.
2 Ibid., p. 164.
3 Ibid., p. 164.
4 Ibid., p. 164.
5 Ibid., pp. 164 ff.
that the bishop is "in each community at once the symbol, the guardian, and the instrument" of that unity.  

He is the instrument of it because 'the bishops, who succeed to the apostles by an ordination which makes them their representatives,' are the possessors of the sacerdotal authority and grace with which Christ endowed His church, and which is necessary for her existence.

Gore sums up this part of his investigation by affirming that from the age of Irenaeus, the Church everywhere recognized the authority of the ministry "derived by succession from the Apostles, and consisting of bishops, presbyters, and deacons". Further, he contends that everywhere the ministers were qualified "with the laying-on of hands of the bishops who were before them, and only in virtue of such ordination held to possess the authority and the grace of God requisite for the ministry they were called to fulfill". However, he also states:

---

1 Ibid., p. 166, referring to Cyprian Ep. xlili. 5; de Unit. Eccles. 5.

2 Loc. cit., referring to Cyprian, Ep. lxvi. 8; Ep. lxvi. 4,5; Ep. xxxiii. 1.

3 Ibid., p. 213.

4 Ibid., p. 214. As has been indicated, this is really the pith of Gore's doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Cf. Chap. VIII, ante p. 349. However, he points to no evidence before Epiphanus to substantiate his claim for the episcopal ordination of bishops.

William Lefroy indicates that though Irenaeus pointed to a succession of bishops from the apostles to his own time in order to substantiate his claim that the apostolic tradition rested on a strong historical basis, he makes no claim that grace is transmitted via the episcopal succession. Therefore,
"It was, of course, only gradually that this ministerial principle gained complete and adequate expression".\(^1\) "There is a development in explicitness of conception and in accuracy and fulness of language. But the principle held the ground from the first with thorough recognition."\(^2\)

The Apostolic Ministry

Having concluded that the principle of Apostolic Succession had obtained acceptance in the Church without exception he contends that the testimony of Irenaeus can in no sense be used to sustain the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as it is generally understood. William LeFroy, *The Christian Ministry* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1890), p. 403. Likewise, S. L. Greenslade points out that to Irenaeus and Tertullian, succession was only a means to the purity of doctrine. S. F. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1953), pp. 215 ff. Further, if Einar Molland is correct, there is cogent evidence to indicate that Irenaeus himself could not have been ordained bishop by anyone of the episcopal order. Einar Molland, "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and Apostolic Succession", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, I (1950), pp. 26 ff. Hence, Gore's statement to the effect that the succession to a See was never substituted for the laying-on of hands, which was therefore always assumed though rarely mentioned (Charles Gore, "Reunion in South India", *Church Quarterly Review*, CX (July, 1930), p. 21\(\times\)) will not do.


2 Loc. cit. Thus it would seem that Gore fully protects himself from any incompleteness in his argument. If the historical evidence should not witness to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, the explanation applicable is that the testimony is not always an adequate expression of facts as they were. It is difficult to fail with this logic. If the evidence testifies to the principle, the principle is no doubt a matter of fact; if it does not, and unless there is positive denial, the evidence is considered inadequate to the fact.
from the middle of the second century onwards,\(^1\) Gore proceeds to examine the beginnings of the ministry from the New Testament documents: \textit{firstly} to answer the question whether the postulates of the early Church are verified by the intention of Christ; \textit{secondly}, to scrutinize the Epistles and Acts for their witness to the development of the earliest Christian ministry. Then he moves on to inspect the documents which shed light on the sub-apostolic period to see whether they bear out the theory of Apostolic Succession and provide the links which explain the method by which the ministry of apostolic days passed into that of the better known period of Church history, i.e. that from Irenaeus downward.\(^2\)

Much of Gore's thought relating to the institution of the ministry has been discussed in the previous chapter. He has brought forth evidence to indicate that it was plainly Christ's intention to institute a ministry within His Church. This was witnessed to by Christ's training of the Twelve as officers and stewards of His Church\(^3\) and commissioning the apostles including the Apostle Paul.\(^4\) Here we refer only to the commission in particular reference to Peter and the Seventy.

\(^1\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 217.

\(^2\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 218.

\(^3\) Cf. \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 219 ff.

\(^4\) Cf. Chp. VIII, ante pp. 333 ff.
Gore asserts that "we have the commission promised to St. Peter." He [Christ] pronounces him 'Peter,' the man of rock, and declares that on this rock He will build His Church.

He [Christ] promises that He will give him "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," or of the Church, and this is in other words promising to make him the official steward of the divine household. However, Gore emphasizes that rather than being a direct commission, this is to be taken as a promise, the commissions being given after the resurrection to the apostles generally.

Thus, though he holds that Peter was "their leader" or "spokesman," Gore asserts: "The solemn delegations of ministerial authority given by our Lord after His Resurrection are so given as to imply the essential equality of all the apostles." Hence, as opposed to the Roman Catholic position, Gore claims that these commissions exclude any "mediatorial" position of St. Peter. He also points out that Peter is minimized in much of

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 222, referring to Matt. 16:18, 19.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., p. 223.
4 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 92; Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 224.
5 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 224.
7 Gore; Roman Catholic Claims, p. 79.
8 Loc. cit.
the New Testament;¹ and that "the apostles at Jerusalem are described as " sending him".²

In reference to the commissioning of the Apostles, Gore avows that, according to the Gospel of Luke, there were seventy beside the Twelve who received a commission similar to theirs from our Lord in the flesh.³ Further, he asserts: "This commission is spoken of as if it were permanent".⁴ He maintains that these too have a share in the miraculous powers of Christ and are clothed with His authority.⁵ From this evidence, Gore deduces that while the sending of men into the

---

¹ Ibid., p. 84.

² Ibid., p. 83. Gore interprets the rock on which Christ will build His Church as, "the rock of a human character confessing the divine claim". Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 223. Hence: "It is as men, as human characters, that the twelve Apostles are the twelve foundation stones of the New Jerusalem." Loc. cit. Further: "We have here at the starting an emphatic intimation that official dignity in the Church is meant to rest on a basis of moral fitness." Loc. cit. Oscar Cullmann in Petrus states: "Petrus nimmt nach dem Gesamtszeugnis der Evangelientradition unter den Jüngern Jesu eine besonders repräsentative Stellung ein." Oscar Cullmann, Petrus (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1933), p. 26. But for Cullmann, he is representative not leader. "Denn es wird ihm ja gerade, keine leitende Stellung gegenüber der Zwölfergruppe zugestanden, sondern er erscheint nur als der repräsentative unter den Jüngern: was alle darstellen, tun und denken, kommt in seiner Person besonders kräftig zum Ausdruck." Ibid., p. 27.

³ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 95.

⁴ Loc. cit.

world as evangelists was applicable especially to the apostles, the Seventy may have shared in their mission.\(^1\) However, he makes a differentiation between those commissioned before and after the resurrection saying that the commission may well have been renewed "for such as them who were steadfast, after the resurrection."\(^2\)

Gore does discriminate the Twelve as a particular group, however. He points out that in the last days of His ministry, Christ's dealings are wholly concentrated upon the Twelve,\(^3\) and that the commissions given after the resurrection were addressed to the Twelve exclusively in their official character.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Gore, *Holy Spirit and the Church*, Appended Note D, p. 70.


\(^4\) Ibid., p. 226. Though Gore admits that others were sometimes present at the commission, (Cf. Ibid., pp. 226 ff.) he also avows that "these commissions taken together are commissions given to an abiding apostolate, destined to be permanent to the 'end of the world'". Ibid., p. 226. The context indicates that he means this in the sense of the per-
He substantiates his argument with reference to the Acts saying: "From the first the disciples appear as a body amongst whom the Eleven, or after Matthew's election, Twelve, are held to possess a ministerial office and commission direct from Christ."¹ He argues that the necessary condition for apostolate is a long companionship with Christ on earth,² and points out that in the community of Christians the disciples were regarded "as a class apart".³ "Of the rest durst no man join himself to them: howbeit the (Jewish) people magnified them."⁴ Gore concludes by stating: "Nothing is more certain than that in the beginning of the Acts the Apostles appear as the judges and pastors or the rulers of the New Israel."⁵ "The twelve Apostles are the twelve foundation stones of the New Jerusalem."⁶

Thus, though Gore admits that the Twelve are in some special sense unique, he also indicates that the term, "apostle,"

petual character of the apostolic office, i.e. after the manner asserted by the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in contrast with it being an abiding office of the Twelve.

1 Ibid., p. 256.
2 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 41.
4 Loc. cit., referring to Acts 5:12.
5 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 47.
6 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 223.
is not restricted to them. He points first to the Apostle Paul, who differentiates from subsequently ordained clergy like Timothy or Titus or later clergy because Paul received his commission not from men "but directly through, as well as from, the risen Jesus whom his eyes had seen and His eternal Father". 1 Gore quotes Paul's own qualification of himself: "In nothing was I behind the very chiefest apostles." 2

Moreover, Gore indicates that the term, "apostle", is used to include others than the Twelve plus the Apostle Paul. He states: "It must be recognized that the term, 'apostles', covered not only the Twelve but Paul and Barnabas, Andronicus, and Junias, and others unknown who were held to have received their commission from Christ Himself." 3 And, he supports this statement with another saying that Ananias, Andronicus, and Junias were apostles in the sense of having received a commission from "Christ in the flesh". 4 The apostolic category is

1 Charles Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London: John Murray, 1900), pp. 49 f., referring to Gal. 1:1.

2 Ibid., p. 49, referring to II Cor. 12:11. However, Manson has pointed out that not even Paul pretended to join himself to the circle of the Twelve. Manson, op. cit., p. 50. Manson also asserts that like Paul, James the Just fits into the category of one having seen the risen Lord and having been commissioned by him, and that Paul apparently thought he was the last to have received this experience. Ibid., pp. 49 f.


4 Gore, Orders and Unity, pp. 94 f. Gore's reference,
further complicated by the inclusion of Barnabas who, according to Gore, St. Paul probably reckons as an apostle and still more confused by Gore's insisting that Timothy and Titus received a "quasi-apostolic commission". This seeming indefiniteness of the "apostolic category" carries over into the entire New Testament ministry.

In general, though, as has been pointed out, Gore does not tie his principle of Apostolic Succession to any particular form of the ministry; the three-fold order constitutes such an integral part of his apology for the doctrine that it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether he is apologizing for the one or the other. The fact is, he argues for both.

In the first rank of the ministry, Gore includes the apostles who represent the general Church rather than particular Churches. However, this order also includes "prophets".

Rom. 16:7, substantiates the fact that Andronicus and Junias were both Paul's kinsmen and in Christ before him, but gives no indication that they had received a commission from Christ in the flesh. However, as we shall see, the supposition that there were others besides the Twelve, James the Just and the Apostle Paul, who received their commissions directly from Christ, is necessary for Gore to protect his doctrine of Apostolic Succession and still account for the fact that the laying-on of hands in the New Testament was a somewhat indiscriminate affair.

1 Ibid., p. 94, referring to I Cor. 9:6.
2 Ibid., p. 97.
4 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 237.
and "teachers" who were more or less closely associated with the apostles.  

Gore admits that the position of these, according to the New Testament evidence, is "somewhat indefinite." Likewise, their authority is somewhat indefinite. Gore asserts that their authority "was either given them by Christ on earth, like that of the Twelve, or was derived from the apostles by the laying-on of hands, or was the authority of an acknowledged 'prophet' probably certified by miracles." But, he points to no incidence where the actual authority was given to this group though he indicates that the prophets ranked after the apostles "in virtue of their prophetic gift," and specifies evangelists as ranking next to them. Thus, of this particular group Gore concludes:

These prophets, teachers and evangelists or apostles who were not among the Twelve were plainly important figures in the church. How did they get their authority? and what precisely was it? We must frankly confess that we cannot at all certainly or fully answer this question. However, Gore can point to good evidence to indicate

1 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 142.
2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 260.
3 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 97. Gore asserts that the prophetic gift required "recognition by the church". Ibid., p. 98, referring to 1 Cor. 14:32. Cf. ante p. 391, note 4.
4 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 166.
5 Loc. cit.
6 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 95.
that the apostles or superior ministry commissioned subordinate ministers by the laying-on of hands, i.e., the appointment of the Seven in Acts 6:2 ff.\(^1\) He also asserts that St. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles was occupied with giving permanence to the stewardship for God and the Churches: "Timothy and Titus are his appointed legates at Ephesus and in Crete, ordained by the laying-on of hands, to fulfil the whole apostolic function of supervision and specially the office of ordaining elders in the different churches entrusted to them."\(^2\)

However, Gore acknowledges that difficulty arises in Acts 13:3 where both those who laid on their hands and those receiving the imposition held the same status as "prophets" and "teachers".\(^3\)

As opposed to the general apostolic ministry, Gore points out that the New Testament documents reveal local ministries

---

1 Gore, *Ministry of the Church*, p. 257. Gore holds that these "seven" were the "prototype" of the deacons, and he makes a special point of the fact that though later Philip could evangelize Samaria, he did not share in the power to lay on hands. *Ibid.*, p. 264, referring to Acts 8:12-16. Cf. Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 97; Chp. VIII, ante pp. 343 ff.


3 Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 96, note 1. Gore points out that St. Paul had certainly received his commission from Christ, so this cannot be an incident of his being commissioned to the ministry. *Loc. cit.*
attached to particular Churches.

Over against the Catholic authority of the apostle is the local authority of the 'presidents,' who 'labour amongst' the Thessalonian Christians and keep them in mind of their duties. 1

From the Pastoral Epistles, which Gore calls the "locus classicus" on the subject of the Christian ministry in the New Testament, 2 he gathers evidence which indicates that these "local 'presidents' or 'bishops' were also known as 'presbyters!'" 3 Again, following the New Testament he calls them "'bishops'" 4 or "'pastors and teachers'" 5 and asserts that they "constituted a college or group of 'presidents' in each Church, and are spoken of as really entrusted with the care of the Church". 6 "To these was also attached the 'assistant' ministry of the 'deacons.'" 7 Thus Gore writes:

In the period of the Pastoral Epistles, then, we have the central or apostolic officers, apostles and evangelists, exercising a more or less general ministry in the churches, and the local presbytery in each church, consisting of the bishops, with the assistant ministry of deacons. 8

---

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 233, referring to I Thess. 5:12.
2 Ibid., p. 242.
3 Ibid., pp. 241 f.
4 Ibid., p. 245.
5 Ibid., Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 167.
6 Ibid., Ministry of the Church, p. 245.
7 Ibid., p. 241.
8 Ibid., Orders and Unity, p. 117.
This is the basis for Gore's declaration that, "since apostolic days there have always been three orders of the ministry," and for his statement: "The Christian church, as it appeared in history for 1500 years, had for its officers bishops, priests, and deacons."

Gore's whole understanding of the ministry is tied up with its dependence upon the apostolic group. He points out that Luke tells us that during the first ministry journey to the churches of Southern Galatia, the apostles "appointed elders for them in every church!", and he continues:

We may assume that this was their regular habit and that the elders, also called bishops, whom we hear of later in other churches, such as Ephesus and Philippi, were appointed by the apostles, and that their appointment was with the laying on of hands.

From this Gore asserts that the ministry instituted by Christ "acted as a ministry intended to be self-perpetuating."

Gore finds his prime examples of those who extend the apostolic office in the persons of Timothy and Titus, whom he calls "apostolic delegates" or "viri apostolici." He

---

1 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 29.
2 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 75.
3 Ibid., p. 98.
4 Ibid., pp. 98 f. Italics not in original.
5 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 302.
6 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 246.
7 Ibid., p. 246, note 3.
declares that Timothy and Titus were appointed to exercise supervision over the Church at Ephesus and the Churches of Crete respectively.

They are not indeed what St. Paul and the other Apostles were, the original proclaimers of a revelation; they stand in this respect in a second rank, as entrusted only with the task of maintaining a tradition, of upholding a pattern of sound words.1

They, nevertheless, exercised supreme "apostolic authority".2 In addition to guarding the tradition, Titus is given the duty of founding Churches, and both Timothy and Titus are appointed to govern Churches.3 Hence: "They ordain men to church orders . . . and exercise discipline over the presbyters".4 They also oppose false teachers.5 Gore likens their position to that of the later episcopal office though he points out that it would not appear that their authority is definitely localized like that of the later diocesan bishops.6 To am-

1 Ibid., p. 246. Here we see the difference between the apostles in the strict sense and their successors. As has been pointed out, Gore makes the Twelve including Paul sui generis in the task of founding the Church and witnessing to the once revealed revelation, but he maintains that it is their pastoral office over the Churches that is perpetuated. Cf. Chp. VIII, ante p. 341.

2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 246.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Ibid., pp. 246 f.

5 Ibid., p. 247.

6 Loc. cit.
phasize the extension of the apostolic office Gore makes a special point of Timothy's representing St. Paul at Ephesus. He states:

Timothy indeed had been left at Ephesus by St. Paul to represent himself in view of that Church's needs, and St. Paul certainly contemplates his continuing his ministry after his own death . . . 1

Hence, Gore concludes that St. Paul "appointed delegates to exercise the apostolic office of supervision in his place, both before and after his death". 2 He also asserts that Timothy and Titus were to provide for "a succession of sound teachers". 3 Although he admits that there is no indication that they "were to ordain men to succeed them in their apostolic office in the local churches", 4 it is the obligation to provide for the succession of teachers that Gore feels furnishes him with evidence of the continuation of the ministry by appointment from above. 5

Gore quits his argument from the evidence of the apostolic period by emphasizing that "the 'viri apostolici' alone have the power to communicate the gift of the Holy Ghost by


2 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 248.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Ibid., p. 248.

5 Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians, pp. 168 f.
the laying-on of hands". The doctrine of Apostolic Succession is traced back to the original apostles, who, according to Gore, held both a unique function as the original witnesses to Christ, and a pastoral function which was perpetual.

... they held a stewardship and pastorate of souls, a function of government and a corresponding power, which they intended to perpetuate in the life of the Church: the Church was not to develop her ministry from below, but to receive it from above by apostolic authorization.

For all of this, Gore admits that the New Testament evidence is inconclusive as to the permanent form of the ministry. "The history of the way in which the ministry of the later church arose out of the apostolic ministry cannot be exactly traced," Gore writes:

Nothing seems to me more certain than that the New Testament documents give no decisive indication of the precise form the ministry was to take. However, he registers no doubt as to the presence of the principle of Apostolic Succession.

The Sub-Apostolic Witness

In regard to the witness of the sub-apostolic age, that

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 269.
2 Ibid., p. 271.
4 Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 144.
5 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 84.
is, the period between the end of the New Testament witness and the beginning of that of Irenaeus, the space bounded by the point where the Acts of the Apostles comes to an end on one side and the middle of the second century on the other, Gore admits that we have very "fragmentary light". He contends, however, that gradually the general ministry disappeared and "every church is governed by a single chief officer, called the bishops, with the presbyters and deacons". He declares that the process by which the transition from the arrangements of the apostolic period to that of the later period took place was not that the persons of the general ministry vanished from the scene, but rather that there occurred a gradual localization in particular Churches of those of the apostolic order who had previously not been localized; the name "bishop" was then reserved for these "localized apostolic officers".

In his exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, Gore gives a succinct summary of his argument.

The apostolic ministry divides itself broadly into the general and the local. There are 'ministers' or 'stewards' who are officers of the church catholic and have a general commission. Such general commission belonged, of course, to the apostles, though mutual delimitations were arranged among themselves and though St. James, who ranked with

2 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 117.
3 Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 30.
the apostles, was settled at Jerusalem. It belonged also, more or less, to 'evangelists' and other 'apostolic men,' who, however, might be temporarily located in particular churches and districts, like Timothy in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete. It belonged also to the prophets, who would have been recognized as men inspired of God in all the churches, and who in the subapostolic age are found in some districts exercising functions like those of the apostles in the first age. The local officers, on the other hand, were the presbyters, who are called also bishops, and the deacons. With this earliest state of things in our mind, we shall perceive that where an apostle or apostolic man was permanently resident in one particular church, a threefold ministry, like that of later church history already existed. So it was at Jerusalem where the presbyters and deacons were presided over by St. James. So it was in Crete under Titus, and in Ephesus under Timothy. So it was a few decades later in all the churches of Asia as organized by St. John. In other parts of the world the exact method by which the ministry developed is a matter of much dispute. But it seems to the present writer most probable that everywhere the threefold ministry came into existence by (1) a change of arrangement, and (2) a change of name. (1) The change of arrangement was the establishment in each local church of a prophet, or one, like Timothy or Titus, who had been ordained to a quasi-apostolic office by an apostle or man of apostolic rank; such a change taking place first in the greatest centres, and then in lesser cities. (2) The change of name was the appropriation to this now localized ruler of the title of bishop or 'overseer' which had hitherto appertained more or less to the presbyters generally.1

Consequently Gore asserts "that there was no time when the presbyters or presbyter-bishops had either the supreme author-

ity of government or the power to ordain". ¹

The first evidence that Gore puts forth as favouring monepiscopacy in the sub-apostolic period is the witness of Hegesippus as preserved by Eusebius. This material is chronologically out of order and Gore's purpose for inserting it here is to give evidence that monepiscopacy ran back into the apostolic age; James, the brother of Jesus, one of the apostolic group being, according to this theory, the first bishop.

Gore states: "'James,' says Hegesippus, 'receives the Church in succession with the Apostles.'"² Therefore, concurring with what he feels was common belief from earliest times, he maintains that James was "the 'bishop of Jerusalem' in the latter sense, i.e. a localized apostolic ruler of the Church".³ Gore further substantiates his claim by referring

¹ Gore, Mission of the Church, p. 30. It has already been stated that Gore makes this assertion in the face of Jerome's evidence to the contrary. Cf. ante pp. 381 ff. J.K.S. Reid has pointed out the import of this transitional problem in view of the doctrine that monepiscopacy as based on the New Testament evidence and indicates that the evidence favouring such a doctrine is somewhat wanting. Cf. Reid, op. cit., p. 29.

² Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 273, referring to Euseb. H. E. 11. 25. Gore maintains that this corresponds with the New Testament evidence. James ranks with the Apostles: (Gal. 1:19, 2:9; Acts 15) but, unlike the Apostles, he is localized in Jerusalem, where he presides with the presbyters, (Gal. 1:19; Acts 12:17, 21:18) and where at the apostolic conference he seems to hold the office of president and speaks with some degree of decisive authority, suggesting and probably framing the apostolic decree. (Acts 15:13, 19, 20) loc. cit.

³ loc. cit.
to the witness of Clement of Alexandria, who, he maintains, asserts that Peter and John selected James as bishop. Gore again follows Hegesippus's testimony in declaring that upon James' martyrdom, Symeon, who was also a relative of Christ, was elected to take James' place. From this evidence Gore concludes:

It is plain then that here at any rate the episcopal office was not only developed under apostolic patronage, but was in direct continuity with the apostolate, as represented by James, who, though not one of the twelve, ranked and acted with them; and whether the presbyters at Jerusalem were ever known as 'bishops' or no, certainly the episcopal authority never belonged to them.

With this as his basis, Gore turns to the witness of the writings of the sub-apostolic age itself. In the pages of the Didache, he finds evidence to indicate that there are "local officers, bishops and deacons, who are elected with a view to the conduct of the worship of the community". However, Gore also points out that, as in the New Testament, there are "'apostles', 'prophets', and 'teachers'" who exercise "a min-

1 Ibid., p. 273, note 5, referring to ap. Euseb. H. E. ii. 23. He also points out that Dr. Lightfoot (Dissert. p. 197) concurs in the opinion that James can be regarded as a bishop. Loc. cit.

2 Ibid., p. 274.

3 Ibid., p. 275.

4 This, he holds, belongs at the latest to the first century. Ibid., p. 276.

5 Ibid., p. 277, referring to Didache xv. 1.
istry not yet localized in a particular Church". Nevertheless, he also avows that the Didache indicates that there are local bishops and deacons who "exercised the same ministry as the prophets and teachers, and are, therefore, not to be 'overlooked'". Hence, there would seem to be an equality which Gore fails to emphasize. However, Gore also finds evidence to the effect "that the prophet has the right to 'settle' in any of the Churches he visits". From this he draws support for his supposition that the bishops in the sense of monepiscopal bishops arose by a process of the localization of apostolic officials who were, in this case, represented by the prophet. He states:

"Can we doubt then that, in the event of this prophetic teacher taking up his permanent residence in any Church, with his authority as an inspired man, with his free power of eucharistic celebration, with his 'high priestly' dignity, he would have become, by whatever name he was called, the bishop of the community in the later sense?"

Nevertheless, Gore also finds information in the Didache that controverts his conclusion that elections and ordinations were always under apostolic control. He points out that though

1 ibid., p. 276, referring to Didache xi. 3, xiii. 2.
2 ibid., p. 279, referring to Didache c. xv.
3 ibid., p. 280, referring to Didache xiii. 1: πῶς δὲ

ἀπόφασις ἐπεξεργάζεται, ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου, ἀσκος, ἐκ τῆς τροπῆς αὐτοῦ. κτλ. It will be remembered that nowhere can Gore point to an instance where a prophet was consecrated by the laying-on of hands.

4 loc. cit.
the community is exhorted to elect the bishops and deacons, nothing is said of any control over the election or of any ordination from above by laying-on of hands. However, he wishes to pass over this information "as not being relevant", because these directions comprising the writing are, he indicates, intended for a local Church. Therefore, ordination, being performed by "the superior order of wandering missionaries", would not come within its purview and would, therefore, naturally not be mentioned. At any rate, he feels that this evidence is against that of the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts, and he does not feel that "this anonymous writing of a very ambiguous doctrinal character" countervails the testimony of the New Testament.

Next, to reinforce his argument for both episcopacy and apostolic succession, Gore again leaves the historical continuity behind and refers to a testimony of Polycrates, who

2 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 113.
3 Gore, Headlam's Hampton Lectures, p. 9.
5 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 114. It would seem that Gore is not being quite fair when he holds a document as giving trustworthy witness when it agrees with him, only to depreciate its value when it does not. Cf. Charles Gore, Dr. Streeter and the Primitive Church (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1930), pp. 17 ff.; Gore, "Reunion in South India", op. cit., p. 217.
pictures St. John as having become "a priest, wearing the mitre, and witness and teacher" before he fell asleep at Ephesus. He supports this by citing Clement of Alexandria who refers to a legend which Clement asserts is not legend but history, that when John the Apostle returned from the island of Patmos to Ephesus, he travelled around the neighbourhood establishing bishops, organizing churches, and ordaining clergy. Gore contends that this reference is to bishops in the latter sense, and he confirms Clement's testimony by the witness of Tertullian who indicates that if the series of bishops of the Church of Asia was taken back to its origin, it would rest upon John's authorization. To complete his argument, Gore refers to a testimony of Irenaeus who speaks of Polycarp, his master, as having been made a disciple by apostles and having been established as a bishop in the Church of Smyrna by apostolic authority. Gore concludes:

Here then is a great body of testimony connecting the episcopacy of the Churches of Asia with St. John. It

3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 287, referring to Tertullian ad. v. Marc. iv. 5.
suggests strongly that St. John regarded it as his apostolic function to perpetuate a church ministry.¹

Returning to the testimony of the sub-apostolic age itself, Gore directs his attention to Ignatius whose claim, he maintains, would force us to regard the organization of episcopacy by the apostles even had we not the direct testimony to which he has just referred.² According to Gore, "nothing could exceed the strength of his witness to the three-fold ministry as being the only form of church government".³ He points out that Ignatius pleads passionately with his readers to "rally round their officers, that is, the bishop, presbyters and deacons in each church".⁴ And, to indicate the importance of the officers within the Church, Gore quotes:

"In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of Father, and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart from these there is none even the name of a Church."⁵

¹ Loc. cit.
² Ibid., p. 283. In order to give a setting, Gore describes that Ignatius’ letters were written during his transport to Rome about A.D. 110-117. Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 119. On this journey he writes letters to the different churches to exhort them to remain true to the authorities of the local churches. Gore, Ministry of the Church, pp. 290 f.
³ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 120. Cf. Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 141.
⁴ Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 120.
⁵ Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 297, citing Ignatius, ad. Trall. 2, 3. This is also quoted by Gore in Orders and Unity, p. 120.
There is no doubt of the high esteem that Gore has for Ignatius' testimony in regard to the ministry. He declares that Ignatius "regards the authoritative hierarchy of the Church as essentially three-fold—a ministry of presbyters, bishops, and deacons" and "presents us with the 'monarchical episcopate' as 'firmly rooted,' 'completely beyond dispute'". Further, Gore asserts that Ignatius "bases his authority on the ordinances of the Apostles".

Most important, as far as Gore's argument is concerned, is that Ignatius speaks of the episcopacy "as co-extensive with the Church that is, as existing everywhere". "He speaks of the bishops as established in the farthest parts of the earth. He knows of no non-episcopal area."

---

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 300, referring to Ignatius, ad. Trall. 3.
2 Loc. cit.; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 122.
3 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 300, referring to Ignatius, ad. Trall. 7. Gore points out that Lightfoot in his Dissertations indicates that the ordinances of the apostles "doubtless refers to the episcopacy". Loc. cit., referring to Lightfoot, Dissertations, i. p. 382.
4 Ibid., p. 301.
5 Loc. cit.; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 122, referring to Ignatius, ad. Aph. 3. Gore notes that Lightfoot states: "Ignatius would be contemplating regions as distant as Gaul on the one hand and Mesopotamia on the other." Loc. cit., referring to Lightfoot, Dissertations i. p. 382. At a later date Gore admits that this point may have been exaggerated (Gore, Holy Spirit and the Church, p. 141) though his argument for episcopacy in the sub-apostolic period hangs on its validity. Cf. Gore, Headlam's Bampton Lectures, p. 9.
that Ignatius indicates that the presbyters could not supply the place of the bishop after he had gone. Therefore, he concludes that they do not share the same office.\(^1\)

However, Gore also finds that Ignatius does not speak of the bishops as succeeding the apostles.

He does not speak of them as succeeding to the Apostles, but he regards them as representing Christ or the Father, or the presbyters, the companions of the bishop, are like the circle of Twelve around their Master.\(^2\)

Gore explains that each Church was, with its bishop and presbytery, a little theocracy representing "a fresh embodiment of that divine presence which was in the world when Christ moved about with His Apostles around Him".\(^3\) Gore's interpretation

\(^1\) Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 304; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 123, referring to Ignatius, ad. Rom. 9.

This differentiation between bishops and presbyters has import for Gore's argument for the episcopacy having been established from the first. Thus, he asserts that the bishops are represented in Ignatius has having a "monarchial authority" which had belonged to the apostles, but never to presbyters. Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 304. He again points out that the differentiation between presbyters and bishops in Ignatius is one of age, as he concludes from Ignatius' speaking of one of "'youthful rank'" in the bishops position, (Loc. cit., referring to Ignatius, ad. Magn. 3.) and he refers to Polycarp and Clement to substantiate his contention that the presbyterial office was not divorced from the qualifications of age. Ibid., p. 305, referring to Clement ad. Cor. 1, Polycarp ad. Phil. 5. Thus, Gore concludes: "The bishops then in Ignatius succeed to an authority which had been apostolic but had never belonged to the presbyters." Loc. cit.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 302.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 303. Gore asserts that "this appears to have been a Jewish way of representing the succession in the Church". Loc. cit. He cites Hesedippus as having spoken of James in a
of this testimony is that the presbyters represent the apostles "before Christ's ascension not after it", 1 while after the ascension "each one of the Apostles became in his turn a representative of Christ". 2 He writes in conclusion:

In a sense, then, the Apostles according to Ignatius have no successors; in a sense, again, the presbyters in their relation to the bishop succeed to them in their relation to Christ when He was on earth; but in yet another sense the bishops also succeed to that office of representing Christ and speaking with the authority of God which had been a special prerogative of the Apostles. 3

Actually, as far as content is concerned, Core's argument in reference to the sub-apostolic age ends with Ignatius. From the evidence so far unearthed, in reference to the Churches of Palestine and Syria and Asia, he concludes that between the time of the witness of the New Testament and Ignatius, the indications are that the chief authority in the Church passed from the apostles and those who ranked with them to the bishops, never having belonged to the presbyters. 4 He sums up his deduc-

---

2 In the Clementines, the bishop succeeds not only to the chair of the apostle but also that of Christ. Loc. cit., quoting Hegesippus, loc. cit. He maintains that this method of succession also appears in the "Apostolical Constitutions". Loc. cit., citing Hegesippus, Apost. Const. II. 26, 28.

---

1 Ibid., p. 304.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., p. 305.
tions by asserting that "James, 'the first bishop,' is a man of apostolic rank and authority settled in Jerusalem, and his office devolved into a line of bishops after him."1 This is followed with the situation as presented by the Didache where the chief ministry in the Church is not yet localized and is known as "'prophets'."2 The latter is a transitional stage to a situation represented in Ignatius, "in which we have a ruler-in-chief localized in each community".3

Gore now turns his attention to the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and the Shepherd of Hermas, to enquire, as he says, "how far this 'confidence of boasting' about the apostolic succession"4 is justified in these documents. He asserts that Clement's letter is definitely an exhortation to the Corinthians to submit themselves to the Church authorities.5

"It is shameful, dearly beloved, yes utterly shameful and unworthy of the life of Christ, that it should be reported that the very steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians, for the sake of one or two persons, is making sedition against its presbyters."6

1 Ibid., pp. 305 f.
2 Ibid., p. 306.
3 Loc. cit.
4 Ibid., p. 308.
5 Ibid., pp. 309 ff.
6 Ibid., p. 319, quoting Clement, c. 47.
Further, according to Gore, Clement expresses the fundamental principle of Apostolic Succession, the appointment of officers from above. "Like the Church of the old covenant she [the Christian Church] approaches God as one body differentiated in function with grades of privilege and dignity, by appointment of God." Again, Gore finds definite evidence in Clement to indicate that the apostles not only appointed bishops and deacons in the Churches but took measures to secure the perpetuation of their office in due succession. However, Gore later admits that this is not a succession such as that needed for the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

Moreover, there is no evidence in Clement of a localized bishop. Gore admits that "it is quite true that presbyters are also called bishops, and that there is no local authority in the church at Corinth above the presbyters." Nevertheless, he also points out that on two occasions Clement refers to "rulers" to whom obedience is due as distinct from presbyters.

1 Ibid., p. 321.
2 Ibid., p. 320, referring to cc. 59-61.
4 "Dr. Gore on the 'Succession' in Clement", Journal of Theological Studies, XXII (1922), p. 77.
5 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 322.
Correlating this distinction with a similar differentiation in the "Shepherd of Hermas, Gore maintains that these "rulers" are men of the "highest order in the Church" and he declares:

"This is the same class of men who in the Didache are known as 'prophets' or 'teachers'", those who were responsible since the apostles' deaths for the appointment of local presbyters, whose authority passed to the local presidents, known as "'bishops'".

It appears then that Clement does recognize a body of men who at least appointed the presbyters at Corinth, and whom it is natural to identify with the 'rulers' mentioned elsewhere.

Therefore, Gore deduces that it is evident from Clement's letter that though there is a general apostolic group over the local Churches, no one of the order of local bishops is yet resident at Corinth.

---

1 Ibid., p. 323.
2 Ibid., p. 324.
3 Ibid., p. 324. Gore compares these to Timothy and Titus who he says "probably filled exactly the same position during the life time of the Apostles". Ibid., p. 323.
4 Ibid., p. 324.
6 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 324. Although Gore admits that Clement's letter affords no evidence at all of his own particular relation to other Church officers, it is interesting to note that his presuppositions lead him to say: "If we could get behind the scenes, we should probably find that
Neither can Gore draw any evidence for his theory of the localized three-fold ministry from the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians. From the statement, "Polycarp and the presbyters with him", Gore makes the conclusion that "Polycarp writes no doubt as a bishop". But, he points out that Polycarp "speaks of no bishop at Philippi, only of elders and deacons, and bids the Philippians obey 'the elders and deacons as God and Christ,' as if there was no higher officer in question there". However, Gore is unwilling to conclude that the only Church authorities recognized at Philippi were the presbyters and deacons. He bases his reluctance to follow the evidence of Polycarp's letter on the testimony of Ignatius who "regarded the chief authority really belonged to him, and that he was one of those 'men of reputation,' one of those 'rulers,' who since the Apostles' death had exercised that part of their ministry which was to become permanent in the Church. One of this order must, we should suppose, always have existed in so immense a Church as Rome." Ibid., p. 325. Cf. Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 126. For evidence supporting this position, he draws on Irenaeus' catalogue of early Roman succession which places Clement in the apostolic lineage after Peter and Paul, Linus, and Anencletus. Gore, Ministry of the Church, pp. 325 f.; Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 127, referring to Lightfoot, Clement, pp. 66-8, 201 ff.; and to Sohn, Kirchenrecht, pp. 175 ff.

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 327. This statement displays the logic of presupposition not of valid conclusion. Gore, however, indicates that "Dr. Hatch (B. L. p. 88 n5) denies that Polycarp is here distinguishing himself from his presbyters". Loc. cit., note 1. Gore also maintains that from the letters of Ignatius to Polycarp in the Church of Smyrna, it can be deduced that Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna, (Loc. cit., note 1) though he gives no reference to substantiate this statement.

2 Loc. cit.
the episcopacy as extended 'to the ends of the earth'. He does not feel that Ignatius would have been ignorant of the condition of the Church at Philippi to which he was going. Further, Gore avows: "It is not unlikely that Ignatius himself had not been merely the bishop of Antioch but the only representative of episcopal authority in Syria." However, Gore would not exactly suggest that Philippi was in the diocese of Thessalonica, but rather that the situation is still transitional between the situation represented in the Didache and that of the local episcopate which he maintains "already existed probably in every town--church of Greece by the middle of the century." It would seem, however, that if this is true it contradicts Gore's contention that Ignatius' statement "to the ends of the earth" would have included Philippi.

Considering the Shepherd of Hermas, Gore points out that Hermas speaks of "the presbyters who preside over the church!".

1 Ibid., p. 328, referring to Ignatius, ad Eph. 3.
2 Ibid., p. 329.
3 Ibid., p. 330. This correlates, Gore suggests, with the fact that "later in the century it is not impossible that there was only one bishop in the Churches of South Gaul", (loc. cit.) which deduction is based on the fact that, according to Gore, "Thessalonica is reported by Origen to have had Gaius (Rom. xvi. 27) for its first bishop." Loc. cit., note 3.

4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., p. 331.
whom Gore identifies with the occupants of the 'chief seat' which Hermas also mentions.\(^1\) Again, Gore maintains that there is evidence of deacons; therefore, the government of the Church of Rome would appear to be one of presbyters assisted by deacons.\(^2\) Again, Gore states: "We have also mention of church 'rulers,' and these in another passage are unmistakably distinguished, as in Clement's letter, from the occupants of the 'chief seat.'"\(^3\)

Gore also indicates that Hermas mentions the "apostles and teachers" who belong to the past generation,\(^4\) as well as "bishops,"\(^5\) and he makes reference to another list in which Hermas includes:

"Apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons, who walked according to the gravity of God and exercised their episcopate and taught and ministered with purity and gravity to the elect of God."\(^6\)

---

1 Cf. *Loc. cit.*, referring to Hermas *Vis.* ii. 4.
3 *Loc. cit.*, referring to Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 2. 6. It will be remembered that in the discussion of Clement's letter, Gore supported his distinction between the class of rulers and those of presbyters by reference to the Shepherd of Hermas. It can hardly be said then that he is employing sound logic when he reverses the process as he does here. Cf. ante p. 413.
5 *Loc. cit.*, referring to Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 27. 2.
Gore's use of the evidence given by the Shepherd depends on the date in which the visions were written down. The alternatives are the days of Clement or of Pius. He maintains that if the visions were recorded in the days of Clement, the "bishop" and "presbyters who preside" should be identified; then, Gore asserts, either the teachers are inserted out of place or the bishops are called teachers like the "presbyter-bishops" of Ephesians 4:11. In this case, he would interpret bishops in the latter sense and suppose that the 'teachers' are equated with the presbyters. If so, it is Gore's argument that the "'bishops'" should be identified with the "'rulers'" and it should be supposed that in the interval since Clement's Epistle the rulers had settled in the local Churches as bishops.

1 Ibid., p. 333. In spite of the fact that Gore admits that Hermas evidently refers to Clement as a contemporary, he takes the evidence given by the Muratorian fragments so seriously as to state: "We have positive information from a contemporary that Hermas wrote the Shepherd at a period which cannot be earlier than A.D. 140." Ibid., p. 331. Gore somewhat tempers his statement as to positive information by noting: "The uncertainty as to date renders the use of this writing difficult." Loc. cit., note 1. However, Gore's sympathies lie with the latter date; hence, he avows that we are almost forced to believe that the writing dates from the days of Pius, i.e. after 140. Ibid., p. 333.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Loc. cit. However, in that everywhere it is not at all clear whether Hermas has reference to a strictly past or present situation, it would seem that Gore is making much of little evidence, and even if his "later" interpretation is accepted, he
From Gore's lack of certainty, it can be seen that he is not ready to deduce that the Shepherd really aids his argument for either episcopacy or Apostolic Succession. Rather Hermas, like Clement and Polycarp, presents a situation which—even if Gore's point is conceded that "the rulers" are the persons of the "general ministry"—resembles much more the uncertain condition of the ministry as presented in the New Testament than either the insistence on the universality of episcopacy, as in Ignatius, or of the episcopal succession, as witnessed to by Irenaeus.

Gore ends his argument with a reiteration of his conclusion that, though it would not interfere with the principle of Apostolic Succession if presbyter-bishops, who had been given the legitimate power to ordain, fulfilled their episcopal office by ordaining one of their own number a bishop, (which function was later confined to one of their number and the rest were reduced to the authority of the presbyteriate of later

has still to explain the existence of the "apostles" who are neither in Gore's theory nor in the writing of the Shepherd identified with the bishops as a localized category. In any case, Gore certainly seems to be misusing his evidence when he makes its interpretation depend on the historical context, the nature of which he is attempting to discover by the content of the writing, i.e. if the witness is to yield historical information it would seem that the proper procedure would be to examine Hermas' testimony to ascertain whether or not its contents supported the existence of a localized bishop at the date of its writing and not allow the presupposed existence of the localization of the three-fold ministry determine the nature of the witness.
Church history and, hence, would not represent an elevation but simply a limitation so that "monepiscopacy" replaces a "diffused episcopacy") he does not feel that this explanation justifies the evidence. Rather, he is certain that a process of transition took place whereby the general apostolate, represented in the New Testament by the apostles and those associated with them, later by prophets, teachers, or rulers or men of distinction, gradually, "after the pattern set by James in Jerusalem or by John in the Churches of Asia became themselves local presidents or instituted others in their place." These, then, according to Gore, became bishops. Hence, Gore claims that the local Church was never allowed to make its own ministry without precedent or superior authority, for ordination must be "from above!". Thus: "There is no trace of elevation in the records of the episcopate."

1 Ibid., p. 334.
2 Loc. cit.
3 Ibid., pp. 335 f.
4 Gore, "Reunion in South India", op. cit., pp. 216 f.
5 Gore, Headlam's Bampton Lectures, p. 8.
6 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 336. It is well known, of course, that Gore's assertions in this matter are in distinct disagreement with Lightfoot's declarations to the contrary. Cf. Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 155 ff.; Reid, op. cit., p. 29.
Estimate of Gore's Conclusions

Now, if we ask ourselves what Gore has accomplished in his "apology for the principle of Apostolic Succession" we find that he has given cogent evidence that, at least at and after the time of Irenaeus, a doctrine of episcopal succession was a device used to substantiate the orthodoxy of the teaching in the Church. And, in an attempt to read the principle back into the New Testament, it would certainly seem fair to state that he has produced evidence to indicate that Christ actually established the ministry in the Church in the persons of the apostles. Further, he has shown that the original Eleven, or after Matthias, Twelve, and including the Apostle Paul, were unique in the sense of forming the Church and witnessing to Christ, the Twelve being the twelve foundation stones, and the judges of the New Israel. However, Gore is certain these held a pastoral office which is perpetual.

Really, then, in his doctrine of Apostolic Succession, Gore does not pretend that those who followed in the pastoral office of the apostles were in the same rank with the Twelve or with the Apostle Paul, who had seen the resurrected Christ. The bishops of the later Church are rather of the nature of those persons associated with the apostles such as Timothy and Titus, who, according to Gore, and he certainly substantiates this in the case of Timothy with New Testament evidence, were
ordained with the power to appoint others as teachers, though there is nothing to indicate that they were to ordain successors to their pastoral office.

Actually, as indicated in the previous chapter, the power of ordination is the only qualification that Gore would hold as necessary to differentiate the order of bishops. It is quite evident from his discussion of Jerome's witness to the situation at Alexandria, that the one essential principle to anyone who claims to be a successor of the apostles is that he possess the apostolic prerogative to ordain men to succeed him. The fact that Gore wishes for more than this would seem to be quite evident from his constant reiteration that the presbyters never held the supreme authority in the Church along with his statement that if they had it would not hinder the principle for which he was apologizing. Hence, the office of bishop, understood in the monarchical sense, does not have a necessary connection with the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and, as has been indicated, the essence of the doctrine is that of a succession of consecrations.¹

In his examination of the New Testament evidence, Gore certainly indicates that there were occasions when those of the apostolic group laid their hands on those who were appointed the minister. Further, Timothy was given specific instruc-

¹ Cf. Chp. VIII, ante p. 349.
tion by the Apostle Paul to select presbyters in the Churches. Hence, there is little room to doubt that the apostles and apostolic delegates appointed at least some of those who, with them, were to minister to the Churches.

However, there is much which Gore does not explain. Many who had the right of the laying-on of hands are not known to have either received the commission directly from Christ or from those who had received it from Him. Also, Gore takes little note of the fact that Timothy was ordained by a presbytery. Even though St. Paul was among those who laid their hands on Timothy, it would hardly have been the case that the Apostle would have stressed the fact of what Timothy received at the hands of the "elders" (I Tim. 4:14) had these elders not had the right or the power to ordain.

Referring to the actual records of the sub-apostolic period itself, Gore first finds in the Didache a period of transition wherein there is mention that it is possible for a prophet, i.e. one, according to Gore, of the general ministry, to settle in a particular Church, although as far as the evidence of the Didache itself is concerned, there is no evidence that this has been done or that if it were, the prophet would be the "bishop". In the sub-apostolic period Gore pays most attention to the writings of Ignatius because Ignatius insists both on the necessity and the universality of episcopacy and
the three-fold localized form of the ministry. However, Ignatius gives no clue as to how the bishops were to be appointed, and his statement of universality is contradicted, as Gore points out but does not emphasize, by the evidence of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas. Certainly, rather than accepting Ignatius' testimony as being literally true, the description of a settled situation, it would seem more reasonable, with T. W. Manson, to point to the testimony of Ignatius as an effort to show the value and, hence, establish the episcopate in each Church. Therefore, according to Manson, Ignatius was attempting to propagate episcopacy, which, instead of having been universally accepted, was a new idea.¹

At any rate, as Gore himself indicates, Ignatius, besides not giving any indication how the bishops are to be appointed, gives no evidence that he knows anything of a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. He represents the bishops not as successors of the apostles, but of Christ.

The best that Gore can conclude from the witness of Clement of Rome, Polycarp and Hermas is that there are exhortations for the Christians to obey their local authorities who in these cases are still only presbyters and deacons. However, he is certain that there existed an apostolic order, though in sub-

¹ T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 59 ff.
stantiating his contention and emphasizing the references to "rulers", which he claims to be the still remaining "general apostolic ministry", in the sub-apostolic period, he contradicts the statement of Ignatius to the effect that in his time, the three-fold local ministry was universal, which statement is his only testimony for the localized three-fold ministry up to the time of Irenaeus.

Thus, it can be concluded that Gore has shown from the evidence of the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods that in the New Testament there was a three-fold form of the ministry, but from the New Testament documents it is not possible to assert that there was ever a specifically three-fold local ministry. In the sub-apostolic period Ignatius gives evidence that there is a three-fold form of the local ministry, but his assertion that it is universal cannot be relied upon; further, Ignatius gives no evidence to indicate how it came into being. As far as the evidence from the Didache, Clement of Rome, Polycarp and Hermas is concerned, it would seem that a fair assessment of the evidence indicates that the situation is much the same as it was in the New Testament.

Above all, neither from the writings of the apostolic nor from the sub-apostolic periods can Gore point to any evidence

---

1 As explained, Hermas' witness can only be used as evidence for the local three-fold ministry if the principles governing historical inquiry are disregarded. Cf. ante, p. 417, note 3.
for the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. From the position of Irenaeus who points to a succession of bishops as a guarantee of the Church’s orthodoxy, which Gore interprets as a mature doctrine of Apostolic Succession, Gore presupposes that it was necessary for each of the bishops to have been linked to the apostles by the laying-on of hands in order to have been validly ordained. Irenaeus mentions nothing of such a doctrine. Neither would it seem that the New Testament gives any evidence of it. Rather, when Paul reminds the Ephesian presbyters of their qualifications, he mentions nothing of their ordinations, but he reminds them that it was the Holy Spirit who gave them their position (Acts 20:23). Writing to Timothy, Paul points out that it was the "gift of God" (II Tim. 1:6) or that given by "prophetic utterance" (I Tim. 4:14) which placed him (Timothy) in a position of leadership. Nowhere is pedigree taken into consideration. As a matter of fact, when the Corinthian Christians trace their Christian genealogies and attempt to place value on the personages who had baptized them, they are strongly rebuked by the Apostle Paul (I Cor. 1:11 ff.).

---

\[1\] The fact that Farrer in considering this passage can say, because of Paul’s admission that he baptized Stephanas, that "the 'first fruit' was in fact distinguished by baptism at the hands of the 'father' [Paul]," which interpretation would seem to give the passage quite the opposite meaning from that which the apostle intended it to have, indicates the desperation of attempting to read the doctrine of Apostolic Succession into the New Testament. A. M. Farrer, "The Ministry in the New Testament", The Apostolic Ministry, edited by Kenneth E. Kirk (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1947), p. 147.
dence extremely well, we can apply to the whole apostolic and sub-apostolic period, even through Irenaeus, the statement which he makes as to the method of appointment of the "general apostolic" group. "How did they get their authority? Or what precisely was it? We must frankly confess that we cannot at all certainly or fully answer this question."1

Without a doubt Gore has clearly shown that Christ intended to institute a ministry. Without a doubt, too, he has shown that Irenaeus followed by Tertullian pointed to a succession of bishops as a guarantee of orthodoxy. Therefore, we must not only conclude that what occurred between the institution of the ministry and the point where Irenaeus points to a succession of bishops is largely conjecture, but from the evidence available, we find no indication that Irenaeus courted the idea that the bishops whom he mentioned were consecrated by those who were consecrated to consecrate, back to the original apostles. In other words, it would seem there is no evidence through the time of Irenaeus or Tertullian to indicate adherence to a doctrine of Apostolic Succession interpreted as an unbroken succession of consecrations. Gore ends where he begins, presupposing both episcopacy and Apostolic Succession, making the latter essential to the existence of the

1 Gore, Orders and Unity, p. 95. Gore admits that before the canonical decisions the development of the ministry was obscure. Gore, "Reunion in South India", op. cit., p. 216.
we can only conclude, as J. A. S. Reid has concluded after reviewing the evidence pro and con for the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the New Testament and in the latest publications on the subject: "To credit with literally essential character for the being of the Church something which rests on so frail a basis is a desperate procedure." Whether or not Ehrhardt is correct in his assertions that the doctrine is a development not of the whole Church but rather of a Jewish contingent of the early Church in Jerusalem which desired to preserve the sacerdotal ministry of the Old Israel within the New, it is certainly true that the doctrine, being an absolute dependence upon historical form and order, comprises elements which would seem to have much more in common with Jewish legalism than with New Testament Christianity wherein we have to do with the resurrected Lord who continually bursts asunder all our human systems. As T. F. Torrance states:

"It is precisely because the Church lives on in the power of the resurrection that it must refuse to be imprisoned in the wrappings of by-gone history or of human systems and decisions."

---

1 Newman presupposes the doctrine to exist in Ignatius. Cf. Chp. I, ante pp. 18 f.
2 Reid, op. cit., p. 37.
3 Ehrhardt, op. cit., pp. 31 f.
PART IV

CONCLUSION AND APPLICATION
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the two great movements in English theology in the nineteenth century having special relevance to the theology of Charles Gore were Tractarianism, which resulted in the re-catholicization of at least part of the English Church on the one hand, and the Liberal movement, resulting in Biblical criticism on the other. As has been pointed out, Gore marks the assimilation of these two once hostile schools of thought in combining his inheritance from the Tractarians, which was a re-emphasis of the creeds, a fresh interest in the Fathers, and above all, a belief in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, with his heritage from the Biblical-Critical school. Thus, he was instrumental in modifying the Tractarian position and taking the initial step in the Liberal-Catholic movement.

It is no mystery, however, that these two once antagonistic schools of theology could be poured into a common mould. Both are a combination of philosophical and Biblical concepts. Anglo-Catholicism had its beginnings in Romanticism. Biblical criticism in Britain was, in the nineteenth century, integrally bound up with idealism. Hence, their bases are closely akin. The ultimate test of truth in both was the reason of man in contradistinction to the Biblical criterion, the mind of Christ.
By basing reality on reason, the way was opened for men's minds to run the gamut from Platonic Idealism to Aristotelian Rationalism. This is especially evident among the first Tractarians who, though basically romantically inclined, could adopt the principle of Apostolic Succession which rested on a pure cause and effect relationship. This apparent contradiction is found plainly in Newman who, though he was undoubtedly inherently romantic, could accept the ecclesiology of the Roman Communion which is avowedly based on Aristotelian principles. More consistently, Liddon can adopt along with a rationalistic interpretation of the foundation of the Church, i.e. Apostolic Succession, a rationalistic interpretation of the Scriptures. While in the Biblical-Critical school to take the extreme case of Jouett, we have an example of Idealism dominating to such a degree that the facts of the Biblical revelation are of a purely secondary and symbolical note.

However, though Gore is in no sense only a combination of his influences, it is important and even vital to the understanding of him to realize that he is basically an idealist who has inherited a belief in the rationalistic principles of Apostolic Succession along with the strong respect for the Scriptures. It is this combination which is basic to Liberal Catholicism.
It has been pointed out again and again that Gore makes an honest attempt to present the historical revelation as it was given. But, because natural man as natural man cannot possibly understand the Christian revelation in that it is of the sphere of the supernatural, so Gore, for all his earnestness, honesty, and scholarship, does not see the Christian revelation accurately when looking through the eyes of idealistic philosophy. Just as it takes a heart that has been torn from its natural sin to receive the Christian revelation, so it takes a mind wrested away from basing its thinking in naturalistic concepts to understand it.

As has been explained in Chapter IV, "Gore's Philosophical Concepts," Gore's refusal to recognize a differentiation between that which is of God and that which is of nature lies in his concept of reason. This spans both the realm of the natural and the supernatural; hence, it is the means for apprehending reality and the criterion of truth.

The concept of reason as a criterion of truth or an Illative sense, as in Newman, which is the expression of the self in decision and is little different from reason in Cole-

1 Hence, Michael Ramsey, when he states of Gore that "he thought and lived within the Bible, and no man has ever done so more", is correct at least in indicating Gore's intention, Michael Ramsey, Charles Gore and Anglican Theology (London: S.P.C.K., 1935), p. 18.

2 Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 149 f., 166 f.
ridge, or Jowett since it is still part of the subjective equipment of man, was common to both schools of thought which Gore inherited. However, as has been shown, in no instance where the philosophical implications have been worked out to any degree of finality such as in Coleridge, Newman, Jowett, and Gore, has the reasoning capacity been allowed to stand by itself as a criterion for truth. Because men's reasons provide different answers, as Newman so well points out, \(^1\) depending on the presuppositions with which they start, the reasoning capacity itself and by itself cannot be held as being sufficient for finality. Therefore, something else is necessary by which the conclusions of one person can be differentiated from those of another. Thus there is the introduction of a moralistic criterion of truth. Hence, for Coleridge, the most pious conclusion is the one to be relied upon; \(^2\) for Newman, it is the criterion of holiness; \(^3\) for Jowett, the content of religion is morality; \(^4\) and, for Gore, the reflection of the mind of God is the development of personality which is the result of moralistic endeavour. \(^5\)

---

5 Cf. Chp. IV, ante pp. 187 ff. Ramsey also points out that Gore was convinced of the "primacy of the moral judgment for theology and religion". Ramsey, op. cit., p. 17.
However, as indicated in Chapter IV in the discussion of Gore's criteria for the truth, after all mental gymnastics, when one begins with the subjective criterion of man's reason, he ends with the subjective individualistic criteria of man's reason as giving him the truth even if morality is brought into the picture.\(^1\) If one is willing to forego metaphysical implications as was Jowett, the problem resolves itself at a superficial level. Hence: "In theology, the less we define," as Jowett says, "the better."\(^2\)

But, refusal of definition can hardly produce a satisfactory theology, and it is to Gore's credit that he challenged his generation to think of the implications of their theology even if he did not work out all of the implications of his own.\(^3\) Gore, like Newman, realized that finally theology cannot content itself by being left suspended in a relativism. The Church, at least, must have ontological reality if it is to be a relevant and living institution. The mistake of the Tractarians propagated by Gore, however, was the mistake of founding the ontological reality or guarantee of the Church's existence not in the living being of the Church, that is, in the living reality of the glorified Christ whose body the Church is, but rather in the Church's origin as a well defined

\(^1\) Cf. Chap. IV, ante p. 192.
\(^3\) Cf. Chap. IV, ante pp. 195 ff.
Thus, the Church becomes an organization with carefully defined laws built strictly on precedent. It is the depository or valid channel through which grace is dispensed and its existence, like the Jewish cultus, depends on a naturalistic, traceable priesthood in which the laws of cause and effect hold full sway. In consequence of this, the Spirit no longer bloweth where it listeth, but it bloweth validly only through the proper human channels. Christ can not ordain through His living body, the Church, for this would be ordination from "below", but He is confined for ordination to a legitimate lineage linked through cause and effect relationship, for this is ordination "from above". Not only can God not validly operate outside these defined channels, but He is no longer free to reject the channel itself as He rejected Judas, for ordination is indelible. Thus, it can no longer be said that where Christ is present among his people, there is the Church, but now it must be stated that where the proper people are gathered, there is Christ.

This goes hand in hand with the Church's being the locus

---

2 Cf. Chap. IX, ante p. 399.
3 Cf. Chap. VIII, ante pp. 345 f.
of moralistic endeavour. Hence, a casuistic doctrine of works prevails. When Gore explains what it means that the Church is the body of Christ, the main connotation of this definition is that the members of the Church are becoming morally Christ-like.\(^1\) When discussing the function of the Church, he places his emphasis on the moral growth of the membership in Christ and leadership in moral reform.\(^2\) Since redemption is equated with man’s moral growth,\(^3\) the sacraments have relevance in so far as they were means to perpetuate the moral uplifting of the individual. Baptism has meaning insofar as it is the initiation ceremony into a community where moral progress is facilitated;\(^4\) confirmation is the deposition of the Holy Spirit\(^5\) which Spirit is the power perpetuating the moral development of the individual;\(^6\) and the Eucharist, the supreme sacrament, is the dispensation of Christ’s body and blood to the end that He dwells immanently in the believer and works in him.

---

5 Ibid., ante pp. 311 ff.
in him to help him achieve moral perfection.\(^1\) The sacrament has an even greater import for the process of self-realization since it is the occasion for the sacrifice of self; hence, it fits perfectly into Gore's personal Idealism which he adopted from T. H. Green, wherein self-surrender is the supreme means of self-realization, the achievement of personality.\(^2\) The locus of the process, self-realization is, for Gore, the Church.\(^3\)

Thus, the whole Church in definition, function, and sacrament has meaning when interpreted casuistically. It is a community of those on the way to salvation, i.e. Christ-likeness, interpreted as moral perfection, i.e. a self-realization. In fact, the Church is literally the body of the Incarnate because its members are communally and through Christ becoming, as they achieve moral maturity, the incarnation of God.\(^4\) This casuistic interpretation of the Church in form and in content, being a direct result of an attempt to combine philosophical and theological concepts, and gathering its meaning from the precepts of Idealism, is as far from the Gospel of Christ as the mind of Saul was from that of the Apostle

---

1 Cf. Chap. IV, ante p. 182.
2 Cf. Ibid., pp. 190 f.
3 Cf. Ibid., p. 190.
Paul. Unfortunately, Gore was not able to take seriously the fact that the gospel was, when it was first delivered and will forever remain, foolishness to the Greek mind and a stumbling block to the Jewish one. ¹

Little wonder, then, that Gore's attempt to discover the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, understood casuistically, in the New Testament is futile. Indeed, if it were present, it would not be the New Covenant that was inaugurated with Christ, but the New Covenant would have been simply an extension rather than a re-birth of the Old. God certainly was free to have extended the Old Covenant, but it would seem that Christians are universally convinced, even those who propound the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, understood as a succession of consecrations, that He did not. Gore points out distinctly that the New Israel was a re-foundation out of the Old. ² It seems most unreasonable, therefore, that the doctrine that provided the continuity in the "old Church" (to use Gore's terminology) ³ should be the continuity for the New. ⁴

¹ T. F. Torrance has pointed out that this tendency to return to Jewish casuistry is already present in the sub-apostolic age when the Gospel is interpreted in terms of Judaising and Hellenistic thought. Thomas F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), pp. 133 f.


³ Loc. cit.

⁴ A. Ehrhardt maintains that already in the Church of
Thus, T. W. Manson is right when he states that Clement is guilty of retrogression when he uses the example of the ministry under the Old Covenant to justify the ministry of the New. However, when the principle like that governing the perpetuation of the Jewish priesthood, i.e., unbroken lineage, is incorporated into the body of Christ, it would seem to be not only retrogression but diametric opposition to the principles of the New Testament. It is a reversion to Jewish casuistry and with it is born into the Christian Church a legalism that could only end where it has, when carried out consistently, in the doctrine of the comprehensiveness and infallibility of the Church as expressed by the Roman Communion.

It would seem that the argument for the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, as Gore understood it, ought to end when it is discovered that the doctrine cannot be found as a

Jerusalem a group was convinced that "an unbroken succession after the Jewish High Priests was essential for the New Israel, the Church." Arnold Emhardt, The Apostolic Succession (London: Lutterworth Press, 1933), p. 81.


2 This, then, would seem to be the most logical answer to Farrer's two questions with which he ends his essay in reference to the power dispersed through the proper channels of the ministry, i.e., those defined by the doctrine of Apostolic Succession: "Where did it go?" and "Where is it now?" A. H. Farrer, "The Ministry in the New Testament", The Apostolic Ministry, edited by Kenneth E. Kirk (London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1947), p. 181.
teaching of the New Testament and most certainly when it is not expressed by the sub-apostolic writers. However, though, as has been shown, Gore fails to point to any evidence for the doctrine as understood the way he understands it—as an unbroken succession of consecrations stretching back to the original apostles, even through the testimonies of Irenaeus and Tertullian—he assumes its presence and, therefore, he is most vigorous in asserting that the doctrine is necessary for the being as well as for the unity and the orthodoxy of the Church.

Even a cursory examination of the history of the Church indicates the fallibility of the doctrine as a guarantee of either unity or orthodoxy. As far as the doctrine guaranteeing the unity of the Church is concerned, it is only necessary to indicate that the greatest schisms in the Church did not occur until after the doctrine was asserted. The doctrine did not prevent the schism between East and West, or that of the Reformation in which the Anglican Church participated; neither did it hinder the schisms which occurred between the Presbyterian, Methodist, or Congregational Churches and the Church of England after the Reformation.

Further, the doctrine seems to be standing in the way of reunion rather than facilitating it. As T. W. Mansen has pointed out:

1 Cf. Chp. Ix, ante pp. 424 ff.
such effective attempts at overcoming division as have taken place in our day have mostly been carried through in non-Episcopal circles [to say nothing of non-Apostolic succession circles] —Presbyterian of Scotland, Methodist of Great Britain, the United Church of Canada, the Church of Christ in Canada, and South India United Church.¹

As to the doctrine guaranteeing the Church's orthodoxy, Gore himself refutes his own claim by writing an entire volume to refute the orthodoxy of some of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic communion,² which communion above all others rests its basis on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as Gore himself understands it.

Apostolic Succession and the Unity of the Body of Christ

However, as is well known, the claims for this doctrine did not end with the passing of Bishop Charles Gore, and indeed this thesis would perhaps have less relevance than it has if the type of thinking exemplified by Gore, following the basic doctrine of the Tractarian movement, could now be said to be defunct. However, this is not the case in the Roman Communion,

¹ Hanson, op. cit., p. 75. However, the Church of South India has accepted an episcopal system. S. L. Greenslade points out that "Augustine saw more clearly that the Cyprianic position as a whole [whose doctrine of the ministry Gore adopts] involved impossible limitations of divine actions, and he also recognized as a practical issue that the Cyprianic doctrine hindered reunion". S. L. Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953), p. 213.

² Charles Gore, Roman Catholic Claims (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900).
which is consistent in its position, in the Orthodox Church, or in Anglo-Catholicism as it is expressed by some of the theologians in the Church of England today. We have only to turn to the publication entitled, *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by K. E. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford and especially to Bishop Kirk's contribution to the publication itself, to realize that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, understood as a casuistic principle, is very much alive and is being apologized for with all the vigour of Bishop Gore or his predecessors.

Like Gore, Bishop Kirk in his essay, "The Apostolic Ministry", admits that the principle of Apostolic Succession is neither "explicitly stated",\(^1\) nor "proved"\(^2\) in the New Testament. Nevertheless, he is certain that the principle must be accepted "with absolute and quite unqualified finality".\(^3\)

But, for all that, Bishop Kirk's essay has the advantage of showing the actual implications of the doctrine as it is commonly understood. There is no doubt that, for him, the being of the Church depends on a ministry which can trace its authority through an unbroken succession of consecrations back to the apostles. So important is the ministry thus defined that "should such a ministry fail, the apostolic Church, which is


the Body of Christ in space and time, would disappear with it".  

Two other essays of the work which have a special relevance to the subject are those of Rev. A. M. Farrer and Rev. Dom Gregory Dix. Farrer in his essay, "The Ministry in the New Testament" begins at exactly the same place Gore does by asking whether the later order evidenced by Church history is the logical outcome of the Gospel of the New Testament, and he ends at the same place as does Bishop Gore by supposing that it is, though he admits that the process of ordination on which the whole doctrine for which he is apologizing would depend is not at all clear. Therefore, he can only base his thesis—that later bishops were of apostolic character—on suppositions.  

Again, Dix in his essay entitled, "The Ministry in the Early Church", begins, as did Gore, with Irenaeus where he thinks he finds firm foundation for his doctrine of Apostolic

1 Ibid., p. 40. However, the end of the above statement, which does not have direct relevance to our discussion, is "... and the whole preaching of the Gospel message to the nations would be in the most urgent jeopardy", (Loc. cit.) makes one question whether Bishop Kirk really takes seriously what he has said about the disappearance of the Church.  


4 Ibid., p. 170.
Succession. However, he admits that the fusion which took place between what Gore would call the "general ministry" and the "local ministry" is not clear cut. Hence, his argument fails at a critical point. Nevertheless, he excuses the lack of evidence for a doctrine for which he is apologizing with the words: "It is stupid in such circumstances to seek for some general legislative enactment in the second century transferring apostolic function from the successors of the apostles to the local monepiskopoi everywhere at a particular moment."

Thus, in spite of the "stir" which H. W. Montefiore reminds us took place at the publication of The Apostolic Ministry, we see in the publication an argument which has not moved very far beyond that which Gore adumbrated near the close of the last century with the publication of The Ministry of the Christian Church. The doctrine of apostolic succession is still supposed to have apostolic and sub-apostolic precedent,

---
2 Ibid., p. 270.
3 Ibid., p. 271. T. W. Manson points out that it is idle to look for a hard and fast system in either worship or organization up to the middle of the second century. Manson, op. cit., p. 65.
the supposition remains an unproved assumption, but, nevertheless the doctrine is held to be of the esse of the Church.

It is only fair to point out, however, that the type of thought represented by contributors to *The Apostolic Ministry* is certainly not accepted on all hands by the Anglican Communion. The authors of the essays collected in *The Historic Episcopate*, edited by Kenneth Carey, though all avowedly maintain the episcopacy as the *plene esse* of the Church,¹ have adequately shown the defects of the arguments advanced by the essays in *The Apostolic Ministry*.²

Especially relevant to the subject before us are the first three essays in the volume. J. A. T. Robinson in his essay entitled, "Kingdom, Church and Ministry" has indicated the necessity for a high doctrine of the ministry: "For the Christian ministry is no other than the ministry, the liturgy, of Christ, Himself",³ but he also adds that "the ministry is not the ministry of Christ only as it is the ministry of the Church".⁴ He asserts:


³ Robinson, "Kingdom, Church and Ministry", *Historic Episcopate*, p. 13.

⁴ Ibid., p. 14.
To establish the validity of the ministry on the
grounds of independent authority of the living
Church (e.g. by linear succession of episcopal
consecration) and then to judge whether a Church
is part of the Body by whether it has a valid
ministry, is to invert the whole New Testament
conception.¹

This practice, according to Robinson, is "to subordinate the
doctrine of the Church to the doctrine of the Ministry",²
which attitude he contrasts with the New Testament concep-
tion saying: "The New Testament bids us have a high doctrine
of the ministry as we like, providing always that our doc-
trine of the Church is higher."³ H. W. Vanstone, in his essay,
"The Ministry in the New Testament",⁴ points out the incon-
clusiveness of the evidence for the conclusion that episco-
pacy exists in the New Testament,⁵ and perhaps most important,
he asserts that, according to the New Testament conception:

It is the content of the preaching which guaran-
tees the status of the preacher, and not the sta-
tus of the preacher which validates the preach-
ing—'if even we, or even an angel from heaven,
should preach to you a gospel other than that
which we have preached, let him be anathema!
(Gal. 1. 8).⁶

¹ Ibid., p. 15.
² Loc. cit.
³ Loc. cit.
⁴ The Historic Episcopate, edited by K. Carey.
ibid., p. 24.
⁶ Ibid., p. 31.
K. J. Woollcombe in "The Ministry and Order of the Church in the Works of the Fathers",¹ points to the difficulty in conceiving that the Apostles could have appointed a second generation ministry,² asserts that Clement was not speaking in terms of "a continuance of the Apostolatë",³ and emphasizes that Apostolic Succession in the early Fathers even after Irenaeus and Hegesippus depended on the ordination of a successor to a vacant See rather than emphasizing the status of those who administered the rite of consecration.⁴ Also, he agrees with Telfer (hence, disagreeing with Gore) that the bishops of Alexandria were consecrated by a college of presbyters until the Council of Nicaea; thus, showing that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, understood as an unbroken succession of episcopal consecrations, could not have been held in the Alexandrian Church.⁵

¹ The Historic Episcopate, edited by K. Carey.

² K. J. Woollcombe, "The Ministry and Order of the Church in the Works of the Fathers", ibid., p. 44.


⁵ Ibid., pp. 48 f. Cf. Chp. VIII, ante pp. 342 f. Woollcombe also contends that there was a considerable difference of opinion in the early Church in regard to the validity of sacraments performed by heretical clergy, (Woollcombe, "Ministry and Order of the Church", Historic Episcopate, pp. 53 ff.) he maintains that Augustine's definition of schismatical
Hence, we see in modern Anglicanism at least two definite schools of thought. The source of those contending for the Apostolic Succession, understood as an unbroken succession of consecrations, as the essence of the Church is, of course, the Oxford Movement as perpetuated and developed by Bishop Gore and others of the Anglo-Catholic School. J. A. T. Robinson tells us that the source of the type of thought which he and those co-operating in the essays in *The Historic Episcopate* represent is the revival of Biblical theology.¹ Both schools feel the necessity of unifying the Body of Christ and though both contend that the episcopacy is necessary for the reunited Church, there is little doubt that while those of the school of thought represented by the writers of *The Historic Episcopate* are willing to think out the necessities of unity on the basis of the New Testament evidence, those represented by the contributors to *The Apostolic Ministry* would seem to be quite as immovable as was Bishop Gore when, after the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, he stated:

"I do not believe that there is any prospect of a reunited Church except on the Catholic basis. Give

or heretical administrations which accepted their validity but questioned their efficacy has been completely reversed. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

that the widest interpretation, still it remains
the fact that Protestantism as a whole was a re-
bellion against it. Isn't it so?"—"The Presby-
terians and other Protestants must come to rec-
ognise that they need an ordination which responds
to the Catholic requirement, in spite of the evi-
dence they have had of spiritual grace and as-
sistance."1

Apostolic Succession and Continuity

However, though it would seem that the evidence is all
against holding the doctrine of the ministry qualified by an
unbroken succession of consecrations and basing the doctrine
of the Church upon it as does Bishop Gore and those of like
mind, this is not to discard the thinking of the members of
the Anglo-Catholic School in reference to the Church alto-
gether, as if they had nothing positive to offer as members of
the Church of Christ. Certainly one of the facets of truth
stressed in Anglo-Catholic thought from which the other

1 G. L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London: Wil-
liam Heinemann Ltd., 1935), p. 454. In his article, "Reunion
in South India", The Church Quarterly Review (July, 1930), Gore
expresses much the same opinion in relevance to a modern prob-
lem. Though written late in his life, this article displays
essentially the same argument for the doctrine of the ministry
as he asserted some forty years before in his The Ministry of
the Christian Church. He asserts that to modify the Anglican
claims of ordination would be to alter the status of the Ang-
lican Church, (The Church Quarterly Review, CIX (July, 1930),
279) that Anglicanism must hold "its power of appeal to the
Catholic tradition about Holy Orders". Ibid., p. 221. There-
fore: "The system [of the Church of South India] must be
(to use the obnoxious word) exclusively episcopalian". Loc.
cit.
Churches of the Reformation can learn is the necessity of the oneness of the Church.

From the conception of the Anglo-Catholic movement by the Tractarians, one of the strongest attributes of Anglo-Catholicism has been its emphasis on the historical continuity of the one Church, the Church as a unity, a single entity from its initial founding by Christ until the present time. It is the Church in all of its glory as well as in all of its sin; the one Body of Christ, the same catholic unity from its birth at Pentecost until its consummation in the Parousia; of this oneness the Church of today in an integral part.

As has been indicated, it was to give the Church substantiality, to guarantee its objectivity in a relativistic world, that the Tractarians emphasized a doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which doctrine Gore inherited. However, the evidence certainly seems to indicate that, not only can the doctrine of an unbroken succession of consecrations from the apostles to modern times not be proven to have been a part of apostolic Christianity, but the adoption of it introduces a casuistic principle into the Church which is diametrically op-

---


posed to the Christianity of the New Testament.

On the other hand, Gore and those today of like mind are quite correct in insisting that we dare not give up the historical continuity of the Church,¹ and this continuity, because it is historical and because the Church has to do with people, must be expressed, as Gore insists, through a succession of persons.² For, though F. T. Forsyth is quite correct in pointing out that the New Testament is the successor of the apostolic witness,³ it is, nevertheless, true, as Gore asserts, that the New Testament itself was written, preserved and delivered, to say nothing of interpreted, by a continuity of persons, i.e. the Church.⁴ Therefore, to be of the Church we must have a succession which stretches from our own day back to the apostles, a succession of persons. However, rather than being a succession joined by the rite of consecration for which there seems to be neither apostolic or sub-apostolic precedent, these persons are linked by The Faith and qualified as were the first apostles by the witness that they bear.⁵ For, if

Christ does not appear unto us in His resurrected body as He did to the original apostles and to the Apostle Paul, and He does not, we are bound to the historical witness of our predecessors.

Gore himself points out that Tertullian testifies to this principle:

"Every kind of thing must be referred to its origin. Accordingly, many and great as are the Churches, yet all is that one first Church which is from the Apostles, that one whence all are derived. So all are the first, and all are apostolic, while all together prove their unity; while the fellowship of peace and the title of brotherhood and the interchange of hospitality remain amongst them—rights which are based on no other principle than the one handing down of the same faith."1

Gore agrees saying:

Here we have a perfectly clear conception of the one catholic Church, founded in fulfilment of Christ’s intentions by His immediate ambassadors, of which every local Church is the representative for a particular area. Behind "the Churches," and prior to them in idea is the one Church which each embodies.2

Thus when Irenaeus and Tertullian rested the orthodoxy of the Church on a lineage of bishops, their purpose was to substantiate the orthodoxy of the Church by pointing to the historical channel by which the Christian doctrines had been

---

1 Gore, Ministry of the Church, p. 18, referring to Tertullian, de Fraesscr. 20.

2 Loc. cit.
delivered, They were making an appeal to the historical continuity of the Church by pointing to those who had received and passed on the doctrine of Christ. Hence, they were simply following the precedent of the Apostle Paul who, writing Timothy, appealed to the faith which "dwelt first in your grandmother Lois and your mother Eunice" (II Tim. 1:5). Therefore, the succession which is necessary if the Church is to remain on earth is a succession of those who believe and witness, and in that they believe because of the witness of the first apostles, this succession is an APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

All who believe that Christ is the Lord in the sense that the New Testament witnesses to Him are successors of the apostles, for all who share the apostolic belief are dependent on the apostolic witness. We all have been taught on the historical plane; we all have received the witness from those who have been before, who received it from those before them step by step back to the original followers of Christ.

It was not until Cyprian, Dr. Lightfoot informs us, that the sacerdotal view of the ministry, which elevated the episcopate to a position of independence, arose. Thus, though the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, as Gore understands it,

is not of the apostolic or sub-apostolic Church, the preservation of the historical continuity, which the doctrine is thought to furnish, is not eliminated. Rather, the continuity of the Church is supplied through the historical succession of believers, those who have heard from those who have heard—from those who saw the resurrected Lord.

The succession, then, necessary for the esse of the Church is not a succession of consecrations or of particular persons designated by certain consecrations, but a succession of those who believe. It is a succession of believers and witnesses that Christ has maintained and will preserve until He comes again. These are of the APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION. It is to this SUCCESSION that Christ has promised his presence until "the close of the age" (Matt. 28:20), and where Christ is present among those who believe in Him, there is His CHURCH.
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